ESSAYS ON SĀMKHYA AND OTHER SYSTEMS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

PARTS I & II

ANIMA SEN GUPTA, M. A., Ph. D., *Vidya Vis'arada*
Patna University, Patna

Asian Educational Services
NEW DELHI 110016

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/essaysonsmkhyaot00unse

ESSAYS ON SĀMKHYA AND OTHER SYSTEMS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

PARTS I & II

ANIMA SEN GUPTA, M. A., Ph. D., *Vidya Vias'arada*
Patna University, Patna

[Extracts from articles from this book may be reproduced with due acknowledgement to the source. The author will also give permission to translate any of the articles in regional languages.]

B
131
S44
1977

Published by :

M. R. Sen

8, Subash Nagar (Mumfordganj)

P. O. Kutchery

Allahabad–2 (U. P.)

Revised & Enlarged Edition : *August 1977.*

Library Edition : Rs. 30/-

Ordinary Edition : Rs. 25/-

Printed by the United Press Ltd., Patna-4

FOREWORD

I have great pleasure in writing a foreword to Dr. Anima Sen Gupta's book "Essays on Samkhya and Other Systems of Indian Philosophy."

Dr. Anima Sen Gupta is one of the most brilliant thinkers of India : she is working as a Reader in Philosophy at the Patna University. She is already wellknown as a writer on Samkhya System of Indian Philosophy.

In the present volume, she has collected some of her valuable papers and articles on various topics of Indian and comparative philosophy, published in various journals. A perusal of the book will reveal to the reader, how penetrating, clear and critical approach she has got to Indian thought. She is one of the very few Indian women today who have devoted their lives exclusively to philosophy. Her writings bear the stamp of maturity and sobriety—rarely seen in the writings of young authors.

I appreciate very much her view that "philosophical endeavours should not stop at the intellectual discovery of truth alone : it should inspire a man to reach a state of enlightenment thereby transforming his behaviour and outlook upon the world."

I congratulate the author on this excellent publication. I am sure she will bring out more books on Indian philosophy.

Atreya Niwas
P. O. Hindu University
Varanasi

Dr. B. L. Atreya
(*Padmabhusan, Knight Commander : Darshanacharya*)

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

"Essays on Sāṁkhya and other Systems of Indian Philosophy" is a collection of articles on different systems of Indian Philosophy published in various philosophical journals from time to time.

I received letters of appreciation from kind and generous readers about these contributions. In fact, some of them gave me the idea of bringing out a book knitting together these materials. I sincerely hope that the book in the present form will be of some value to those interested in the study of Indian Philosophy.

In some of the papers, I have tried to show the Indian attitude towards philosophy. The Indian attitude emphasises that philosophical endeavours should not stop at the intellectual discovery of truth alone : it should inspire a man to reach a state of enlightenment thereby transforming his behaviour and outlook upon the world. It seems to me that this "attitude" is a remarkable contribution of India to the world-culture. When the truth is realised, an individual becomes a new man and is able to see new significance and value in life. I have stressed this point in my essay "Philosophy : Indian and Western". Similarly, I have pleaded for re-orienting the history of Indian Philosophy in another essay on the subject.

If any of the essays in this book delights my readers, I shall feel that my labour has been well-compensated.

Krishnaghat Quarters
Patna University, Patna
November, 1964

Anima Sen Gupta

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION

After publication of the first edition, I wrote a number of articles on various aspects of Indian philosophy. I have thought it desirable to include these articles in the already published edition and bring out an enlarged edition bearing the same title. I have tried to present my original viewpoints on various topics of Indian philosophy in an easy style. I am sure this enlarged edition will be helpful to teachers and students interested in the study of Indian philosophy. The materials have, however, been arranged in two parts.

The appreciation of this book by the press and the scholarly public has exceeded my expectations. I am not anxious for its gaudy get-up. If the articles delight my readers, I shall think that my labour has not gone in vain.

Lastly, my grateful thanks are due to my maternal uncle Mr. M. R. Sen, a seasoned journalist, who inspite of his failing eyesight worked hard to edit the contents of the book and bring out the enlarged edition.

Krishnaghat Quarters Anima Sen Gupta
P. O. Patna University
Patna, Bihar, India
15th August 1977

CONTENTS

PART I

	Pages
The Basic Principles of the Classical Sāṁkhya Philosophy	1—8
Sāṁkhya in the Mahabharata	9—20
Vacaspati and Vijñana Bhiksu on the Bhoktr-bhāva of Puruṣa	21—27
In Defence of the Sāṁkhya Puruṣa and its Multiplicity	28—36
The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Conception of Soul—a Critical Exposition	37—44
Sūnya-vāda in Nyāya-sūtra : a Critical Exposition	45—52
The Central Core of Buddhist Philosophy ..	53—60
Saṁkara and Rāmānuja : a Comparative Study ..	61—72
Meaning of Advaita according to Vijñāna Bhikṣu	73—82
Meaning of Immortality in Upaniṣads and Vedānta	83—90
Meaning of Yoga in the Philosophy of Bhagavad Gita	91—95
History of Indian Philosophy : Its Re-orientations	96—105
Philosophy : Indian and Western	106—111
Western and Eastern Spiritual Values of Life ..	112—123
Spirituality—Indian and American : a Reply ...	124—127
Tantra Cult in India	128—132
The Karma-yoga of Swami Vivekananda ..	133—142
The Concept of Humanity in Indian Culture ..	143—155
Vivekananda on God	156—164
The Iśvarakṛṣṇa and Vijñāna Bhikṣu on relation between the World and the World-cause ..	165—170

PART II

	Pages
Philosophy of Sāṁkhya : its value in the present age	173—177
Logic in the Sāṁkhya School	178—181
Metaphysics in the Sāṁkhya	182—185
Sāṁkhya and Vivaraṇa School	186—193
Sāṁkhya Puruṣa & the Jivasakṣi of Advaita Vedānta	194—200
Theistic Sāṁkhya & the Philosophy of Rāmānuja : a review on the basis of cultural history of the age	201—209
Vaisesika Categories	210—211
Sāṁkhya & the Taoism of Ancient China	212—219
The Philosophy of Ramanuja : its basic principles	220—223
Ramanuja on Prakṛti	224—228
Philosophy, Religion & Life	229—238
Metaphysical Basis of Indian Social Thought ..	239—247
Philosophy for a Fuller Life	248—251
Rebirth & Karma	252—263
The Vedic Age : its Humanistic Approach.. ..	264—272
Humanistic Approach of the Dharma Sutras & the Epics	273—280
Carvakas : What They Stood For	281—288
Hedonistic Tone of the Carvaka Philosophy ..	289—294
Rita, Karma & Taqdir	295—301
The Avatāra & the Jivanmukta	302—306
Madhusudan Saraswati : The Great Advaita scholar: Part I	307—316
Madhusudan Saraswati : the Great Advaita scholar : Part II	317—322
Sureśvarācārya : The Great Advaita Philosopher. ...	323—326
Spirituality & Human-life	327—333
Theosophy & Ancient Indian Wisdom ..	334—341
Yajnavalkya : the Great Sage of Mithila ..	342 351

THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF CLASSICAL SAMKHYA PHILOSOPHY

The Sāṃkhya perhaps represents the oldest formulated philosophical thought in India. It has many affinities with Buddhist and Jaina thoughts, and Vedānta philosophy has assimilated many of its hypotheses.

Life is a ceaseless flow of experience. Therefore, it is expected that a good philosophy which seeks to explain the significance of life in relation to the universe should establish its claim by showing that it is based on a thorough analysis of experience. A penetrating analysis of human experiences is the starting point of the Sāṃkhya philosophy. Its fundamental principles and categories were not merely dogmatically postulated but were discovered after a proper study of consciousness. The epistemological aspect, therefore, assumes an important form in this philosophy. Puruṣa and Prakṛti, the guṇas and their conjunction and disjunction are not mythical but are at the very root of the possibility of experience or knowledge.

Theory of the Guṇas

The distinguishing characteristic of Sāṃkhya is its Guṇa-theory which holds that all mental and material objects of this phenomenal world are the combination in different proportions of the three ultimate reals (*triguṇa*). The conception of these *guṇas* arose undoubtedly as a result of the analyisis of experience and its objects. Each fact of experience becomes so by virtue of its relation to consciousness. There is something special in it *i. e.* some sort of intelligibility, by reason of which it easily gets related to the totality of experience of a particular person. Consciousness is revelation and if we are to become conscious of something, that thing must have some characteristic, by virtue of which it can be revealed as being related to consciousness as its object.

When a chair becomes an object of consciousness, it becomes so only because it possesses in itself the capacity of becoming revealed as soon as it comes in contact with consciousness. This capacity cannot be discovered in the so-called qualities of the chair because the qualities can be abstracted and still the object can be conceived as existing and getting related to consciousness without contradiction. This power therefore, exists in the very being of the object and can very well be identified with that (being). Each fact of experience is a being or *sattā* and this constitutes its intelligibility. This intelligibility is the ultimate factor in an object of experience and it is called the *sattva-guṇa*.

The object of experience also possesses certain characteristics like resistance, impenetrability, shape and form which are in fact due to "massiveness" in objects. Therefore, mass or *tamo-guṇa* is another element present in the object. Again, the object undergoes changes. It changes from state to state as well as from form to form. This change or movement is due to the presence of the third principle which is called *rajo-guṇa*. *Sattva, rajas* and *tamas* are the three *guṇas* which are the causes of all sorts of experience of a *Puruṣa* or sentient individual. These are objective, ultimate and the irreducible elements of experience. All objects of this world, both mental and physical, are the results of different permutations and combinations of these three ultimate reals. Our thoughts are as much the effects or the modifications of the ultimate reals as the so-called physical things, the only difference being that in the mental sphere the element of *sattva* predominates, whereas in the sphere of the physical universe, *tamas* becomes the dominating element. *Tamas* is present in all our ideas of objects, otherwise these mental products could not assume the forms of their objects in order to make possible the experience of an individual.

The *guṇas* are also said to be feeling substances. Since the whole externai world is made up of these three, each object of experience possesses the capacity of produciag three

different feelings in our minds, *viz.*, pleasure, pain and delusion or indifference. So from the point of view of knowledge, these three *guṇas* are known as *sattva, rajas* and *tamas,* but from the point of feeling they appear as pleasure, pain and delusion. A lovely woman, for instance, excites the feeling of pleasure in her beloved, the feeling of pain in her co-wife, and the feeling of delusion in her disappointed lover. This is because *sattva, rajas* and *tamas* which on the plane of consciousness appear as intelligence-stuff, energy and massiveness, and on the plane of feeling as pleasure, pain and delusion, have themselves been transformed to create that lovely woman. The lovely woman is not merely the assemblage of ideas in some mind as is held by idealistic philosophers, nor is she absolutely distinct from thoughts and feelings as is held by the realistic philosophers. Thought and feeling, matter and the so-called intellectual processes do not lie in two absolutely distinct regions : they have originated from a common source, *viz.*, the *guṇas.* Therefore the establishment of any kind of direct and indirect interaction (as is actually observed in our daily life) is not at all difficult. Thus the correspondence between the mental world and the outer world has been explained by Sāṃkhya on the hypothesis that they represent two allied lines of development from the three *guṇas.*

The creativity of these *guṇas* is not and end in itself. On the contrary, it serves as the only means for the attainment of a Purusa's end. Enjoyment and liberation are these ends (*puruṣārthas* and the *guṇa*-stuff creates the ceaseless flow of modifications and complexities for his enjoyment and liberation. The three *guṇas* create bondage and at the same time nurse in themselves the secret of emancipation. Birth, death, old age and sorrow exist in the world of the three *guṇas,* and to set the soul free, the *guṇas* also display the tendency to withdraw within themselves, thereby dissolving the world-show for the liberated spirit.

The *guṇas* and the Puruṣas are the main principles accepted in Sāṃkhya. Both the categories are equally eternal

but while the puruṣas are pure and inactive principles of consciousness, the *guṇas* are the unconscious, ever-changing, dynamic energy of the universe.

Prakṛti and the Disturbance of the Prakṛti-state

When the three *guṇas* are held in a state of equilibrium and there is no manifestation of any characteristic, it is called *Prakṛti*. This *prakṛti*-state of the *guṇas* is absolutely indeterminate, undifferentiated and homogeneous, and it exists as the potential source of energy of the whole world. The three *guṇas* constitute the ground forces, from which the world has come into being. The movement within these *guṇas* either holds these three in a state of equipoise or breaks up their equilibrium just to make them change and develop in the form of this universe. Since the *guṇas* themselves are the Prakṛti, they never get merged into something else. There is no other entity that can be admitted as their cause. Prakṛti or the three *guṇas* in the state of equilibrium is the root cause of the whole world.

The process of the world always reveals itself as an unending series of causes and effects, and when by following the long line of causation, we arrive at the concept of Prakṛti, we find that this ground principle is to be supposed as eternal, uncaused and beyond the region of this phenomenal existence.

The most important characteristic of Prakṛti is that it is out and out productive (being an assemblage of the three palpitating reals). Primal Nature is ever undergoing changes. Being is not the only irreducible ultimate of experience. Movement or becoming is also another incontrovertible principle of experience and this is Prakṛti or *Triguṇa*. The material world is evolved out of Prakṛti when there is a disturbance in the *guṇa*-equilibrium. This disturbance is due to the union of Prakṛti with the inactive 'mind' (*cit*) whose purpose is served by the evolution of Nature. Nature is no

doubt unconscious and unintelligent, still there is some inherent (unconscious) teleology in the three *guṇas*, due to which they produce this world. This inherent teleology means the disposition of unknowingly serving the purposes of the 'enjoyment' and 'liberation' of a Puruṣa. Thus the movement of nature for the production of the world is in a manner controlled and influenced by the transcendental Puruṣa. Just as the unintelligent milk flows from the udders of the cow for the nourishment of the calf, so it is the function of unconscious nature to liberate the souls from the sorrows and sufferings of the world. This unconscious teleology is an important hypothesis, by which the classical Saṃkhya seeks to explain the creation of this well-ordered universe by an unconscious Prakṛti, even in the absence of any active guidance from Puruṣa.

Puruṣa and its Union with Prakṛti

All the movements of Prakṛti are said to be for the experiences and liberation of Puruṣa, so the consideration of Puruṣa's nature and its relation to Prakṛti is an important problem for Sāṃkhya. Prakṛti stands for the unconscious dynamic principle that undergoes changes and transformations for the creation of the empirical world. Although the contents of consciousness always change and become different, consciousness as the principle of illumination and revelation remains always the same. So there are not merely changes and transformations here : there is also the permanent principle of consciousness which manifests all these passing phenomena of the world. This eternal principle is the Puruṣa. An unconscious Nature alone cannot produce a world which seems to be full of meaning and purpose. Hence at the root of this world, we have to infer the existence of spirit which somehow influences Prakṛti in the process of evolution. Puruṣa is pure consciousness and as such it is changeless and infinite. It is a transcendental principle and therefore its real nature *per se* is non-apprehensible by experience.

The Sāṃkhya seeks to prove the existence of the soul on the ground that as the controller and enjoyer of the world of composite things, some intelligent being must exist and that this intelligent being must not be of the nature of pleasure, pain and indifference. The world process, therefore, is not moving and developing aimlessly in a capricious manner : on the contrary, there is Puruṣa or pure consciousness which, though inactive, yet through reflection, co-ordinates, synthesises and gives meaning to all worldly experiences. Again, Prakṛti is unconscious and therefore the release striven for must relate to a principle other than Nature. This principle is Puruṣa. When this Puruṣa through beginningless ignorance, identifies itself with Prakṛti, the world comes into being. Therefore, the establishment of the union of Prakṛti with Puruṣa becomes a very important problem for the classical Sāṃkhya which seeks to solve the problem of this union between the two rigidly distinct principles of spirit and nature through its theory of reflection. According to this system, *buddhi* or intelligence is an intermediate link between these two opposite principles. *Buddhi* partakes of the nature of both (being an evolute of nature and being essentially *sāttvika* in character). It serves as the reflecting agent, although unspiritual and unconscious in essence. The notion of a person or of an experiencer arises when the *cit* is reflected in the *buddhi*. The actual enjoyer of the worldly pleasures and pains is the empirical ego formed by the reflection of consciousness in *buddhi*, united with its own conceptual determinations. But due to the presence of transcendental illusion in *buddhi* from beginningless time, the various experiences of the fictitious self (intelligised *buddhi*) are owned by the real self, as it were, and they appear as the experiences of the Puruṣa. This illusion is regarded as the bondage of the Puruṣa. The fictitious and artificial union between spirit and nature causes a commotion or a dislocation of Prakṛti from the state of equipoise, as a result of which the evolution of different categories in their own graduated series immediately starts in

the collocation of the *guṇa* reals. All objects of this world are the creations of these moving *guṇas* and consequently each moment, every object of the finite universe is undergoing changes. The potential is thus becoming the actual in course of such transformation. This transition from the potential to the actual is what is known as causal transformation.

Causation

Regarding the relation of cause and effect, the Sāṃkhya holds that before actual production, the effect exists in the cause in the form of potential energy, due to certain obstacles which prevent its manifestation, but as soon as the barriers are removed, the energy gets a free passage and produces the necessary transformation known as the effect. Creation is only the process of transforming the implicit into the explicit form. All things remain in potential form in Prakṛti before creation and when the *guṇas* are thrown out of balance, Prakṛti gradually changes into different categories of the universe. Although this law of causation reveals to us a continuous process of becoming, changes do not hang in the air. Becoming is the becoming of some dynamic force which, though essentially mutative, is still the underlying support of all changes and mutations.

Sāṃkhya Atheism

Sāṃkhya recognises the existence of two principles, static and dynamic, for building up a comprehensive doctrine for explaining the being and becoming of the whole universe. The inherent teleology in Prakṛti demands that creation should proceed in a manner that will be beneficial to Puruṣa, either in the direction of enjoyment or in the direction of salvation. The purpose of the Puruṣa passively guides and controls all the activities of the *guṇas* and so the idea of God as the creator of the universe is not needed.

The fundamental doctrine of the classical Sāṃkhya is the dualism of Puruṣa and Prakṛti. These two are supposed

to be entirely distinct and independent, and no attempt is made to derive them from a higher principle or God. The apparent union between Spirit and Nature (due to *avidyā* or ignorance) is the cause of *saṃsāra* or the world process. All our misery is due to ignorance. *Buddhi* and Puruṣā are distinct and different but through ignorance, a seeming unity between the two is wrongly established by us, as a result of which, sorrows and sufferings which really belong to *buddhi*, seem to follow us from birth to birth. It is therefore necessary to understand the distinction between Puruṣa and Prakṛti. We should form in *buddhi* the true conception of the nature of Puruṣa and then with the help of this saving knowledge, we shall be able to attain liberation from the miseries of the world.

The Concept of Liberation

The classical Sāṃkhya is of opinion that so long as we remain on the empirical level only, we cannot enjoy unmixed and pure happiness. This is the most important truth regarding our life on earth. So if we are to rise above sorrowful existence, we must first of all realise that all worldly pleasures lead to sorrow and that no worldly means can remove for ever the suffering of this mundane life.

Change is in Prakṛti alone and it is the body that grows old and dies. The spirit is ever free and is entirely distinct from Nature. When Puruṣa and Prakṛti will be perfectly discriminated from each other through the purification of *buddhi*, sorrows and sufferings of life will come to an end. Thus by freeing itself from the sense of its false identity with Prakṛti, Puruṣa attains liberation and this liberation is the highest goal of human life.

SAMKHYA IN THE MAHABHARATA

The Sāṃkhya, one of the oldest philosophical enquiries of India, has been shaped and re-shaped in different ages. Materials available for the study of Sāṃkhya are scattered in various works like the Mahābhārata, the Gītā, the Purāṇas etc. In this article I will particularly refer to the lucid analysis of Sāṃkhya concepts as expounded in the Mahābhārata. Of course, the ideas are scattered and diversely explained and the task of spinning out only one coherent system of thought is fraught with risks. Both theistic and atheistic versions of the Sāṃkhya system can be gathered from the Mahābhārata without much strain and twist. The most common view of Sāṃkhya that has been frankly and openly admitted in several chapters of the *Śānti Parva* of the Mahābhārata is, however theistic and monistic ; although an atheistic tendency, too, represented by the teachings of *Pañcaśikhā* boldly hovers round this theistic conception.

THEISTIC ACCOUNT :

Puruṣa, Prakṛti and the Puruṣottama

The existence of a *puruṣottama* (the highest spiritual being) as the ultimate reality is too apparent in the Mahābhārata ; and *puruṣa* (individual self) and *prakṛti*—the spirituality and physico-mentality—are but phases of this highest Lord.

Prakṛti is no doubt endowed with the dynamic power of evolving and dissolving this lovely universe ; but she does not, of her own accord, perform this wonderful function. She is fully under the influence of One Spiritual principle, who is her Lord or Master (Triguṇādhīpa) : and it is this Lord who makes her play with her own creative powers and energy. This spiritual principle is, therefore, the highest reality that transcends and includes both *prakṛti* and individual *puruṣa*.

This is the principle of consciousness that illumines and supports everything. This is the *bodha* and the *bodhanīya* : (Jīva and Iśvara) the thinker and the thought : the enjoyer and the enjoyed : the smeller and the smelt : one who touches and the touched ; the seer and the seen : the hearer and the heard and the knower and the known. In other words, it is the supreme principle of the whole universe, because *pradhāna* which is known as the source of *mahat* etc. is included in this eternal being. (The Mahābhārata ; Śanti-parva 351, 17-18).

The highest principle has no rival or opponent. Whenever duality is spoken of, it refers in all contents to the duality between *sattva* and *kṣetrajña* (perceiving self) and not between the *puruṣottama* and any other principle. Materiality and spirituality seem to become the lower and the higher phases of the highest being, and these two phases, though different in nature, are still in a beginningless association because such a union is necessary for the creation and maintenance of this world. Nature is the dynamic principle that brings into existence all things and beings of this world. The innumerable ripples and rhythms of worldly life, its rugged rocks and green valleys : its pleasures and pains : flowers and thorns—all are due to this moving and palpitating power, often termed as nature or *prakṛti*. Pure individual consciousness that appears as the knower of this worldly existence is not an active principle. Thus we gather from the valuable teachings of the Mahābhārata, the idea that nature creates everything, but it does so only under the control of the highest spiritual existence. (Ibid. 314-12). The distinction of spirit as inactive and Nature as active is recognised in the great epic of India : but this duality is transcended in the final state of release when *kṣetrajña*, the 25th principle, becomes emancipated from the clutches of the *guṇas* by its becoming one with the absolutely supreme spirit or the 26th principle which is the final support of all. (The Mahābhārata : Śānti-parva : 308, 9-13).

The Kṣetra : the Kṣetrajña and their Duality

Duality or distinction is to be maintained between the 24 categories of Nature and the 25th principle which is clearly and aptly spoken of as *kṣetrajña* or the perceiving consciousness. The 24 categories, including *avyakta*, constitute the physico-mental conglomeration known as the *kṣetra* (field) and the individual soul that resides inside this whole is known as the *adhiṣṭhātā* or the knower of the field and this is the principle that has been numbered as the 25th one. *Avyakta* or *prakṛti* is also called *sattva* or *Īśvara*, (The Mahābhārata : Śānti-Parva : 306—41), since this is the source of all originations and creation. The 25th principle is different from nature and its categories : but it is not the highest principle as it has been distinctly stated in the Mahābhārata that this 25th principle or the *kṣetrajña* becomes united with the 26th principle—its source at the time of release or *kaivalya*. The *kṣetrajña* stands for the perceiving self or the living principle of self within the mind-body complex in the Mahābhārata, as there are reasons in favour of this contention.

It has already been stated above that the 25th principle is called *kṣetrajna* as it knows the *kṣetra*. In other words, the 25th principle has been identified with the *kṣetrajña*. It is in the state of bondage alone that the encased self i.e., the 25th one fails to realise its non-distinction from the 26th principle. It falsely boasts of its being the highest category through ignorance. But when it becomes the *kevalī*, it perceives its unity with the 26th principle. Nilkantha, too, while explaining the passage *kṣetrajñāpi—yadā tāta-tāt kṣetre sampralīyate*—has identified *kṣetrajña* with the 25th principle. If this principle attains *kaivalya* and thereby becomes merged in the highest category, it cannot refer to any other being except the individual self within the mindbody system.

While discussing the points of distinction between *sattva* and *kṣetrajña*, it has been stated that the latter is without any

support or substratum ; but that should not be accepted as a justifiable ground for interpreting *kṣetrajña* as some divine personality other than so many witnessing selves possessing different mind-body complexes. *Kṣetrajña,* being the principle of consciousness, is identical with the pure, stainless, super-sensible consciousnes, which has been spoken of as the supreme *puruṣa.* It has been clearly stated in the Mabhābhārata that just as one fire becomes many, one sun is the source of all light and the same air blows in different directions ; in the same way one supreme self assumes the forms of so many selves, being focussed through different bodies. Now, if this living principle of consciousness is nothing but a spark of the supreme self, getting entangled in the meshes, woven by *prakṛti,* then there is no harm in characterising it as a self-reliant principle—which indeed it is —if viewed properly from a correct angle of vision. It is the universal consciousness—only limited by *antaḥkaraṇa* to a particular individual and thus individualised by it.

This perceiving self is in fact different from the mind-body complex with which it gets identified through ignorance. The epic transfers all activities to *sattva* or nature and makes the self entirely inactive. *Prakṛti* is unconscious, but *kṣetrajña* is just the opposite. The self simply perceives whatever is produced by nature or *sattva.* Though radically distinct, yet these two principles are related together like fish and water or fly and fig-leaf. It is because of this relation and also under the spell of ignorance that the spirit identifies itself with nature and considers itself as the active and creative principle. The wants, appetites, desires and passions which really belong to *antaḥkaraṇa* are owned by the spirit as parts and parcels to itself. In other words, due to complete self-forgetfulness, the spirit becomes submerged in *prakṛti* and enjoys and suffers worldly pleasures and pains, i.e. bondage. It may be mentioned here that in our discussion, the word *sattva* is taken in the sense of *prakṛti* and not in the sense of *buddhi,* whenever it has

been contrasted with the *kṣetrajña*. Of course, among the three *guṇas*, it is *sattva* in the *buddhi* that catches the reflection of pure consciousness and thereby creates the false impression of identity. Still, *buddhi*, being itself the result of permutation and combination of the three *guṇas* presupposes a previous existence of the three *guṇas* or *prakṛti* in contact with the spirit. It is not the ultimate category although it is the first evolute from which all other categories have evolved. So, while *kṣetrajña* refers to the individual witnessing self, *sattva* refers to the psycho-physical substrate or *prakṛti*. Moreover, in chapter 306 of *Śānti-parva*, *prakṛti* has actually been described as *sattva*.

The Guṇas

Prakṛti has been declared to consist of the three *guṇas*—*sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*—and all objects of this world are spoken of as their products. These are also the three factors that act like coverings in relation to *puruṣa* and due to the existence of these *guṇas*, the soul suffers delusion ond misery. It is only by transcending all the *guṇas* that one can attain liberation from the cycle of birth and death. But the Mahābhārata does not give us any clear and definite idea regarding the nature of these three *guṇas*. They are generally referred to as representing different mental states—good, bad and indifferent. Living beings are also divided on this ground into *sāttvika*, *rājasika* and *tāmasika*. Those who have predominance of *sattva* in them are born in a higher world : those who are under the influence of *rajas* are born as man and those who have a predominant element of *tamas* are born as animals.

Buddhi or Intelligence Stuff

Buddhi has been given a very prominent place in the epic philosophy where it has been clearly stated that the whole universe is shot through and through with the *buddhi* and that all materials both merge and emerge from this very cosmic principle : (The Mahābhārata : Śanti-parva : 194,17-18).

The epic has often given in the doctrine of the development of the *Bhautika* elements of the universe from *bhūtātman* and *bhūtakṛt*. In our opinion there is justifiable ground for accepting the term *bhūtātman*, as standing for *buddhi*—the great germ of the whole world. If *buddhi* is the main source from which the whole creation has sprung up, then it is only just and reasonable to hold that the five elements have also originated from this single principle. *Ātmā* in *bhūtātmā* does not seem to imply any spiritual entity like self or God. It refers to *buddhi*—the first category—without which the world could not have been brought into existence. Since it is the main principle of creation, it has been described as the *ātmā* of all *bhūtas*. In chapter 285 of Śānti parva, we come across the word *bhūtakṛt* which, too, may justifiably be regarded as meaning the intelligence-stuff, i.e. the first born category of Nature. But *buddhi* is not treated as the only source of these *bhautika* elements in the Mahābhārata. There are other suggestions, too, which trace the development of the elements from the Absolute Being or from the mind, although their commonly-held source is *ahaṁkāra*.

The Categories

In the epic philosophy, too, the various parts of the empirical world are derived from nature ; but on this point there prevails a number of views with marked variations among themselves. Thus, in one version there are five senses, mind, intellect and spirit as *kṣetrajña :* in another the spirit is admitted as the ninth element ; as *chitta* a new element has been added to the group. In chapter 306 of Śānti-parva, however, we find an enumeration of 8 *prakṛtis* together with five organs of sensation—the five of action, mind and the five objects (16 *vikārās*). These are almost similar to categories enumerated in the classical Sāṁkhya : the important difference being the omission of the term *tanmātra* in the philosophy of this great epic. Again, in chapter 310 it is stated that according to the Sāṁkhya system, *mahat* first of all arises

from nature : from *mahat* arises *ahaṁkāra* : from *ahaṁkāra* originates the mind and from the mind the five elements come into being.

Empirical Plurality and Transcendental Unity of the Souls

The souls, so long as they are in the union with nature, are many in number : but as soon as they realise their distinction from nature they abandon *prakṛti*. They then enter into the Supereme Spirit—the final merging ground of all multiplicity and difference. It has been repeatedly stated in the Mahābhārata that the individual *puruṣas* are many and that they can be relieved of their burden of sufferings by their abandonment of *prakṛti* and its evolutes. This abandonment, of course does not mean the annihilation of *prakṛti*. It simply refers to the realisation of his own nature by an individual *puruṣa* and the consequent transcendence of *prakṛti* by him. In this state, therefore, he sees his difference from the psychophysical structure : and nature too fails to affect him in good or bad manner. In this respect there is similarity between the theistic view of the Mahābhārata and the classical view.

The Concept of Time

Time occupies an important place in the epic. Individuals are born in different bodies due to their accumulated merits and demerits under the influence of time. Time as a category regulates and determines to a certain extent the destiny of living beings. In the dialogue between Asitadevala and Nārada (Śānti. Ch. 274) eight kinds of *bhūtas* are mentioned such as *bhāva, abhāva, kāla, pṛthivi, apas, vāyu, ākāśa* and *tejas* : and *kālā* is spoken of as that which being impelled by *bhāva* brings into existence all *bhūtas* out of the five elements : viz. earth, air, water, wind and light. The senses themselves are not the knowers : but produce knowledge for the *kṣetrajña*. Higher than the senses is *citta*,

superior to this is *manas*, higher than *manas* is *buddhi* and the highest of all is the spiritual principle.

Findings

From the above discussion it is clear that the Mahābhārata gives us a more thorough exposition of the theistic sāṁkhya than what we gather from the study of the upaniṣads. The epic explains in detail the distinction between *kṣetrajña* and nature : and this perceiving self is set over against the 24 categories of *prakṛti* constituting the sphere of empirical knowledge. The perceiving self or the transcendental ego is not the real doer and enjoyer. It is simply the pure and spectator-like consciousness that forms the background of our empirical existence. In the epic philosophy, this transcendental ego has no doubt been regarded as different from the psycho-physical organism : but in order to avoid dualism and atheism, both of them are made to hang on the 26th principle which is the final abode of the whole creation. Here the influence of the upaniṣadic doctrine is clearly visible as the upaniṣads also make *jivātman* (individual soul) independent of Nature only, while maintaining all through the view that both of them are rooted in the Brahman. It is, therefore, understandable from the facts mentioned above, how through different handling in diverse periods, this transcendental ego assumed the status of the transcendental *puruṣa* of the classical sāṁkhya, without the patronage of the 26th principle namely the *puruṣottama* (The ultimate reality which is all inclusive). Different categories of nature are also more fully analysed and the order of their development is also more clearly explained in the epic—although there is variation from the ciassical sāṁkhya in this respect. The five elements are not always derived from *ahaṁkāra* and different views are given regarding the development of the categories. The sāṁkhya ideas are thus in the process of formation, side by side with the other orthodox systems. In this manner, a definite advance from the Upaniṣadic state so far as systematisation of

materials is concerned is visible in the epic philosophy. The Mahābhārata definitely says that all sufferings are due to the false identification of *prakṛti* and *kṣetrajña* and that the final liberation will be effected from a recognition of the distinction between spirit and matter. The sāmkhya in the epic recognises a plurality of souls only in the empirical sphere. The souls are many so long as they are in union with nature ; but as soon as they become enlightened about their own distinction from *prakṛti*, they at once return to the 26th principle of *puruṣottama*. The epic philosophy is thus definitely theistic in its general outlook and the elements of sāṁkhya are mostly pressed into the service of this trend of thought. The Mahābhārata describes the philosophies of sāṁkhya and Yoga as two eternal ancient systems taught by Kapila and Hiraṇyagarbha respectively and they were then not separated. The sāmkhya is the highest truth with a belief in God as the 26th principle of the universe.

Teachings of Pañcaśikha on Atheistic line

The view of *Pañcaśikha* (mentioned as the disciple of Āsuri) is, however, different from this theistic conception which is so prominent in the Mahābhārata. According to him, the highest reality is not the *puruṣottama* or God, transcending and absorbing both spirit and matter. It is rather a unified category of *avyakta* and *puruṣa* or in the words of Dr. .S. N. Das Gupta : 'it is *avyakta* in the state of *puruṣa*. (History of Indian Philosophy : Vol. I : page 216). It is due in all cases to the conglomerated association of our body, mind and the element of *cetas* with the self. *Cetas* is the psychical element which is to be combined with physical elements to generate consciousness in the self...Consciousness arises from the unification of these psycho-physical elements with the self, and these elements are the constituents of *avyakta*—the ultimate ground of this objective world. The collective whole of the elements is called the *kṣetra* and the self that resides in the mind is called the *kṣetrajña*. The

existence of the self is admissible, as otherwise we shall have to believe that all ceases with death, which is not really true. Again in the absence of a postulate of self, it will be difficult for us to give a rational explanation of duties and the sense of moral responsibility. To prove his point of view, *Pañcaśikha* has introduced a critical discussion on the buddhistic and the *lokāyata* views both of which deny the existence of a permanent self. Consciousness can never be produced from a combination of different physical elements only to perform the functions of life and its various processes. If consciousness is regarded as a quality of the body only, then we are in a fix to understand why it vanishes altogether from a dead body which is still a conglomeration of all *bhautika* elements. That which residing in the body, the body lives and departing from the body, it dies, must be different and other than the mere physical and elemental combination. This, therefore, is the soul. The *lokāyatas* do believe in the existence of deities who can be propitiated for the removal of cold and heat etc. Now, these deities cannot be mere elemental conglomerations, since in that case they will be mortal like all other worldly things. So, the permanent soul does exist as the undeniable principle of life and all living processes. Further, formless consciousness cannot spring forth from elements having forms, as this will contradict our experiences. Nor can we think of the self as a stream of passing mental states, as in that case the results of A's action will be enjoyed by B and not by A who has performed those actions. Hence, as permanent upholder of consciousness, we are forced to believe in the existence of an abiding self, which truly constitutes the spiritual basis of life and experience. The state of release is, however, described as being identical with that when all rivers completely lose themselves in the ocean. (The Mahābhārata : Śānti Parva : 219-42) This is a state of pure neutrality which cannot be described in terms of the usual qualifying adjectives. For that reason *Pañcaśikha* says that there is neither ultimate destruction, nor ultimate reality

of a determinate type. The *mokṣa*-state is indefinable. It cannot be described as a state of consciousness, since consciousness is not the essence of the soul.

The three *guṇas* are also spoken of : but *guṇas* are as usual referred to signify the good and bad qualities of the mind. The elements become conglomerated naturally and there is no need for any prime mover or God. The various organs of sensation and action with their objects, are also elaborately discussed by *Pañcaśikha*. The elements of material bodies remain together in a collective whole by their nature and they are separated also in the same manner. One who confuses this conglomeration of body-mind with the soul, suffers misfortunes and misery and is never released from bondage. Since this conglomeration is not the self, any attachment to this as 'I' and 'mine' is false.

A similar view is also given in the Śanti Parvan (203) in which the self, apart from the body, is described as imperceptible on account of its non-manifesting character like the moon of the new moonday. In other words, the self in itself, is characterless and it acquires characteristics only when it becomes associated with the body. This is also the view of *Pañcaśikha* on the nature of the self. In the state of release the soul becomes *alinga* and unmanifest. *Pañcaśikha's* teaching may be regarded as a continuation of the idea of the Bṛhad Upaniṣad where it is stated by Yājña-valkya that after death there is no consciousness. Just as a lump of salt dissolved into water, is completely lost in it and it is not possible to detect it : yet wheresoever you may take any part of it, it invariably tastes salty : so this great endless limitless being is solidified thought. Arising from those elements, it is destroyed after death and there is no consciousness after death. (Bṛhad Upaniṣad—2. 4. 12). The passage is, indeed very obscure and even Maitreyi, his wife, took it in the sense that after death there could be no consciousness. *Pañcaśikha*, has also tried to establish his

doctrine in the same manner. In his opinion salvation means complete destruction of all positive characteristics including consciousness.

Consciousness arises from the conglomeration of elements and is destroyed along with them. At death, there is no consciousness. This atheistic teaching of *Pañcaśikha* later on has found a more detailed and logical development in the Sāmkhya of Caraka : most probably this trend of thought, by gradually gathering strength, has ultimately developed into the traditional atheistic sāmkhya of Īsvarakrishna.

VACASPATI AND VIJNANA BHIKSU ON THE BHOKTRBHAVA OF PURUSA

In this article I propose to consider critically the interpretations offered by Vācaspati Miśra and Vijñāna Bhikṣu in regard to the Bhoktṛbhāva of Puruṣa mentioned explicitly in the fourth argument of the seventeenth Kārika of the *Sāmkhya Kārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa.

The philosophy of Sāmkhya is not merely a dualistic system : it is also a rationalistic and realistic metaphysics, because it mainly depends on logical analysis and argumentation at every step. Being an orthodox system, it believes in the authority of the Vedas. But it has not made any attempt to justify any of its views by appealing to the revealed texts.

The Sāmkhya arguments for the existence of puruṣa are based on Logic and Reason and they are quite in harmony with the dualistic and realistic position of the classical Sāmkhya.

Critics have expressed doubt about the applicability of the fourth argument to prove the existence of puruṣa. It is argued that if puruṣa is by nature neutral and indifferent to all worldly happenings, then how can we ascribe bhoktṛbhāva to puruṣa ? Both Vāchaspati and Vijñāna Bhikṣu have tried to solve this riddle in a manner which will not be incompatible with the unaffected nature of puruṣa.

We should remember that the seventeenth kārikā has been employed by the author of the *Sāmkhya-kārikā* to prove only the existence of puruṣa and not its indifference and neutrality. This puruṣa is one that has been caught in the snare of prakṛti. It is a subject that reveals naturally any

object that happens to be in its proximity. [This *viṣaya-sambandha,* however, does not prove that puruśa is not indifferent. On the contrary it is admitted that consciousness as a revealing principle only (*Prakāśātmaka Caitanya*) cannot but be neutral]. Perception of the visible world is not possible in the case of pure matter : nor is it possible in the case of pure Spirit. It is only the seemingly unified category of Spirit and matter (Jīva-puruṣa) that can be the perceiver of the *Dṛśya* through modifications of the intellect.

Accordingly, to Vācaspati *bhoktṛbhāva* of such a jīva-puruṣa refers to its capacity of perceiving the world in a manner as if the latter has been imaged in its own *vṛttis.* In the *Tattvavaiśāradi,* Vācaspati has introduced his unique conception of *cicchāyā* with a view to explaining the *bhoga* or bondage of puruṣa. Whether this *cicchāyā* refers to a unique relation or to simple reflection of *cit* in *buddhi* has not been clearly indicated. For the purpose of this paper, we shall, however, be using the term '*cicchāyā*' to signify the reflection of consciousness in buddhi although in practical life we do admit a distinction between *chāyā* and *pratibimba.* In the opinion of Vācaspati Miśra, due to *Sannidhāna,* a reflection of consciousness is caught in the *buddhi* by virtue of which all *buddhi-vṛttis* get apparently changed into consciousness ; and this apparent change in the character of *vṛttis* gives rise to a sense of false identity between puruṣa and *buddhi.* It is on account of this feeling of false unity that the *buddhi-vṛttis* are understood by the *aviveki* puruṣa as parts and parcels of its own nature. It is this false appropriation that has been described as the *bhoktṛbhāvā* of puruṣa.[1] Since the consciousness of puruṣa is the cause of manifestation of the modifications of *buddhi* in the waking state, it seems as if puruṣa is non-different from the intellect and there is only one principle, not two. This fact has been mentioned by Pañcaśikhāchārya in his famous sūtra *Ekameva darśanam, khyātireva darśanam.*

1. *Tattvavaisaradi,* Chapter 1-4.

Although *puruṣa caitaṇya* is radically different from the intellect, the two are fused together intimately so as to give rise to a false sense of oneness which hides the real truth.

While explaining *sannidhāna,* Vācaspati has said that this does not mean any form of spatial or temporal contact between puruṣa and *buddhi.* Rather it implies a special kind of capability or *yogyatā* on the part of puruṣa to enlighten the states and the processes of *buddhi,* as a result of which, in the state of ignorance a false sense of ownership arises in the spirit. Hence the spirit appears as the *pramātā, bhoktā* etc.[1]

Vācaspati's view has been criticised by Vijñāna Bhikṣu on the ground that mere *cicchāyā* in *buddhi* is not potent enough to account for the world-sense of the real puruṣa. If *buddhi* is only intelligised by the single reflection of consciousness in it and there is not the double reflection of the buddhivṛttis in Spirit, then, truly speaking, there can only be a relation between the image of puruṣa and *buddhi* and not between *buddhi* and real puruṣa. In such circumstances, intelligised *buddhi* plays the part of both the revealer and the revealed and as such this theory commits the fallacy of accepting one and the same category as both *kartā* and *karma.* Further, if *yogyatā* is believed to constitute the nature of puruṣa, it will continue even in the state of emancipation and, therefore, puruṣa's experience will never come to an end. Consequently, emancipation will become meaningless. Hence, Vijñāna Bhikṣu gives us his theory of double reflection which explains the *bhoktṛbhāva* of *jiva-puruṣa* in a better manner. According to this view, *buddhi,* first of all, reflects the consciousness of puruṣa and becomes intelligised with the result that the inherent *ahmkāra* of *buddhi* is falsely appropriated by the self. After that, the modification of the intelligised *buddhi* are reflected back in the spiritual principle so as to reveal the objects (the forms of which have been caught in

1 *Tattvavaisaradi* (3) 1—4, (b) 11-24.

the *buddhi* states) as objects of enjoyment of an experiencing person. Here an intimate relation is established between *buddhi* and real puruṣa through reflection of *buddhi-vṛttis* in the self.

Just as the eye receives colour only and not any other quality, in the same manner, puruṣa receives in itself only the reflection of the modifications of *buddhi.* Real enjoyment in the forms of various psychological changes caused by actual spatio-temporal contact of the intellect with various worldly objects belongs to the intellect and not to the real self. It is the intellect that can be changed into the form of a jar and also into the form of intelligence : but consciousness cannot be changed in any manner. It can only reflect in itself intellectual modifications due to its own illuminating nature.

The reflection of consciousness in intellect, however, is incapable of revealing *buddhi-vṛttis* through which objects are manifested and enjoyed, because the image of consciousness formed in the *buddhi* is not potent enough to cause enjoyment of objects just as superimposed fire is not suitable for cooking food. Further, in the opinion of Bhikṣu, this type of double reflection does not affect the unchangeable character of spirit because change always means creation of new qualities : and no new quality is generated in the soul as a result of its union with buddhi through reflection.

From the above discussion, therefore, it would appear that according to Bhikṣu, a full fledged experiencer emerges when *cit* is reflected in the buddhi and the apparently intelligised buddhi and its modifications are reflected back in the puruṣa. It is due to this reflection of the intellectual modifications in spirit that the false sense of ownership arises easily in the self as a result of which there happens to be *'ekamevadarśanam, khyātireva darśanam'* on the part of puruṣa.

Now, if we reflect on these interpretations offered by the two great commentators of the classical Sāmkhya, we find

that both the views can be accepted with equal cogency as explanations of the *bhoktṛbhāva* of puruṣa. Vācaspati's interpretation though severely criticised by Bhikṣu, is, in fact, not less satisfactory than his own view. We shall be able to realize the merit of Vācaspati's view provided we succeed in catching the real spirit of his brief exposition. His view is quite in keeping with his advaita position and there is no logical error even from the point of view of the dualistic Sāmkhya. The concept of *yogyatā* which Vācaspati has made use of in explaining the enjoyment of puruṣa, does not really involve any logical contradiction, if understood in its proper spirit. *Yogyatā*, in fact, implies capability inherent in the nature of the self for (1) manifesting and also for (2) appropriating through *aviveka* all modifications of *buddhi* caused by the contact of the latter with various worldly objects. That the self is ever fit for manifesting everything that comes in its way will be denied by nobody. Difficulty arises in respect of the self's capability for participating in the benefits offered by the intellect.

We should remember that this participation is logically possible due to the fact that the self is a revealing principle and in actual active state, this participation is caused by the false idea of ownership generated by *aviveka.* In fact, the Spirit's participation in worldly experience is nothing but a perverted manifestation of the visible world due to existence of ignorance in the form of a great principle of Confusion. So, enjoyment of puruṣa in the form of perception, implies truly that in the inactive state *aviveka* leads to the connecting of the spirit with the intellect which, in its turn, leads to the idea of ownership (in the spirit) from which arises immediately the experience of pleasures and pains. *Dṛśya* or the visible objectivity seems to form the *sva* of puruṣa so long as it remains entangled in the creative activities of prakṛti. Hence, *yogyatā* (for owning the experiences of pleasures and pains) becomes effective only when the self remains under the spell of ignorance. In that miserable condition of the self,

mere *sannidhi* is potent enough to cause intelligisation of all that has been placed in the proximity of the puruṣa. Then, due to its inherent capability or *yogyatā*, assisted by ignorance, the spirit comes to recognize all intelligised *buddhivṛttis* as parts and parcels of its nature. This capability or *yogyatā* (being the nature of puruṣa) does not exist as a quality to be lost in the state of liberation. Even in the state of final liberation, this fitness exists in the self, but in the absence of the medium (i.e. the intellect) through which objects are to be received, there is no revelation of objects of sense. Further, due to the total annihilation of *aviveka*, the question of having the feeling of ownership of experience on the part of the spirit does not arise at all. To jīvan-mukta puruṣa who has succeeded in removing totally the veil of *aviveka*, *prakṛti* appears as wholly different from and inferior to puruṣa. There will, no doubt, be the world-sense through the operation of *buddhivṛttis* in the active state of his worldly existence pending exhaustion of all his *prārabdha karma*. Still in his case there will no longer be *"ekmeva darśanam"*, even though *yogyatā* will be present, (because the latter causes confused perception only when it is assisted by *aviveka*). In the transcendental sphere, *yogyatā* exists only as the revealing capacity of puruṣa : but in the phenomenal sphere, the same revealing capacity vitiated by ignorance gives rise to a confused perception as a result of which the fictitious idea of ownership of world-experience arises in the spirit.'

Vijñāna Bhikṣu has not accepted either of these two concepts (*sannidhi* and *yogyatā*) to explain the relation of puruṣa and *buddhi*. According to him, a more satisfactory explanation can be offered by us, if we accept the theory of double reflection. Mere *cicchāyā* (reflection of consciousness) in the intellect is not suitable enough for providing the puruṣa with multi-coloured world-sense. For this purpose, all intelligised *buddhivṛttis* should be reflected back in the spirit. It is only in such a plight of puruṣa that *aviveka* is capable of generating in it the false idea of the ownership of *buddhivṛttis* as its *sva*

i.e. as its own modifications. In the state of final liberation due to the absence of both ignorance and intellectual modifications, there will neither be the operation of double reflection nor the confused perception of the intellectual concepts as the self's own possession. In the Jīvanmukta condition also, due to the total removal of *aviveka*, there will no longer be *abheda-grahaṇa* and consequently, there will no more be the confused perception of the two as one.

Vācaspati being the propounder of the *Bhāmati prasthāna* of the advāita Vedānta, has not accepted the *bimba-pratibimba-vāda* of the *vivaraṇa-school*: perhaps due to this fact, in his interpre tation of the *Sāmkhya-kārikā* and yoga-sūtra, he has not adopted the *bimba-pratibimba* method for the purpose of explaining the relation between puruṣa and *buddhi*. In his writings, he has used the word *cicchāyā* to refer to the relation of *cit* to intellect. That intelligisation of *buddhi* together with *aviveka* (the assisting condition) is necessary for causing the confused perception of puruṣa, has been admitted both by Vācaspati and Vijñāna Bhikṣu. While Vācaspati has mentioned *aviveka* as the sole assisting condition for causing false indentity of puruṣa with intellect, Vijñāna Bhikṣu has stated a third condition in the form of the reflection of the intelligised *buddhivṛttis* in spirit.

Vācaspati has no doubt tried his best to keep unimpaired the dualistic and realistic position of the Sānkhya by recognizing the reality of *yogyatā* and *sannidhi* : still due to his advaitic bent of mind he has explained bondage, liberation and the relation between the soul and the world as being due solely to ignorance or *aviveka* (just as in the advaita-Vedānta of Samkara, all these are explained as being due solely to the operation of *māyā*) but Bhikṣu, by admitting the relation of double reflection between puruṣa and *buddhi* in addition to ignorance, has succeeded more in providing us with a truly realistic explanation of the bondage and liberation of puruṣa. Otherwise, for simple understanding of the true meaning of self's enjoyment, both the theories are equally helpful to the readers.

IN DEFENCE OF THE SANKHYA PURUSA AND ITS MULTIPLICITY

The philosophy of Sāṅkhya is not merely a dualistic system ; it is also a rationalistic and realistic metaphysics, because it mainly relies on logical analysis and argumentation at every step. As an *āstika darśana*, it believes in the authority of the Vedas ; but it has never made any attempt anywhere to justify any of its views by an appeal to the revealed texts.

The Sāṅkhya arguments for the existence of self and also for the establishment of its numerical plurality are based on logic and reason. The logical procedure followed in this respect does not seem to involve any difficulties or contradictions. All the arguments concerning Puruṣa and its multiplicity are quite in keeping with the dualistic and realistic position of the classical Sāṅkhya.

Professor D. D. Vadekar, in his learned article under the title 'The Sāṅkhya Arguments for the Puruṣa' (published in the *Philosophical Quarterly*, January 1960), has taken great pains to show that the Sāṅkhya arguments employed in the seventeenth *kārikā* have failed to prove the existence of the pure Sāṅkhya Puruṣa. The *kārikā* runs as follows :

Saṅghātaparārthatvāt triguṇādiviparyayād adhiṣṭhānāt
puruṣo'sti bhoktṛbhāvāt kaivalyārthaṁ pravṛtteśca.

These arguments may be summed up as follows ; Spirit exists as distinct from matter, (a) since collocations serve a purpose of something other than themselves ; (b) since this other must be the reverse of what is composed of the three *guṇas* ; (c) since there must be control of the collocations; (d) since there must be an enjoyer ; (e) since there is activity for the purpose of release from the threefold misery.

In the opinion of Professor Vadekar, these arguments fail to prove the existence of the pure Puruṣa, the nature of which has been described in the nineteenth *kārikā* of the *Sāṅkhya-kārikā*, in which Puruṣa has been described as indifferent (udāsīna) and neutral (*madhyastha*).

Here, the first point that should strike us at once is that this seventeenth *kārikā* has been employed to prove the existence only of Puruṣa, and not its indifference and neutrality. This Puruṣa is the one that has been caught in the snare of Prakṛti through reflection. Hence there is no difficulty in supposing that this Puruṣa is a purposeful being, and that its purpose is being fulfilled through the activity of the three *guṇas*. Here, one may pose a question : If this Puruṣa is a bound Puruṣa, having connection with desires and passions, then how are we to prove the existence of an indifferent and neutral self ? If we think over the metaphysical significance of the argument deeply and carefully, we shall be able to discover that this argument can be employed to prove the existence of the pure Puruṣa as well. The real meaning of the first argument is that the existence of the unconscious matter becomes meaningful only when it is associated with Consciousness. Matter, by itself, is of no use unless it is revealed by Consciousness. In the absence of its revelation by Spirit, it is as good as non-existent. Prakṛti is pure potentiality, and such a pure potentiality, devoid of any actual character, is of no advantage to anyone. Prakṛti assumes a definite character through its connection with Spirit, and so, in and through the whole process of its manifestation, the meaning of Prakṛti is being constantly revealed through its connection with Puruṣa. Prakṛti looks upwards to Puruṣa and finds in it its true meaning. Consciousness as mere revelation is always pure, indifferent, and non-agent. The word *'saṅghāta'* refers to unconscious matter, and the word *'parārthatvāt'* implies that, without the existence of Consciousness, matter is blind and meaningless.

Even if we understand by *saṅghāta* the objects of enjoyment like bed, mat, etc., and hold that the existence of these objects prove the existence of a *bhoktṛ* Puruṣa only, then also, there will be no contradiction in holding that Puruṣa, in its pure form, is indifferent and neutral. This is because, if we analyse *bhoktṛtva* metaphysically, we find that *bhoktṛtva* ultimately implies nothing but the illuminating consciousness that constitutes the nature of the pure Puruṣa. Such a pure consciousness is always indifferent and neutral.

The examples of bed, mat, etc. are given here only to show that these things cannot have any meaning unless they are related to some conscious being. These examples are not meant to suggest that a Puruṣa, too, enjoys the products of Prakṛti in a manner similar to what we find ordinarily in the case of the enjoyment of such objects by human beings.

Further, there is no such rule that there can be no enjoyment unless there is a desire for it. There may be an experience even when there is no desire for it. The prisoners undergo jail experiences against their will.

The second argument (*triguṇādi viparyayāt*), too, seeks to prove the existence of a Puruṣa who has already been caught in the snare of Prakṛti. It is only in such a Puruṣa that *viveka*, in the sense of intellectual understanding of the distinction between Spirit and matter, can arise. Such *viveka* is a *vṛtti* of the intellect. So, it is only a Puruṣa endowed with *buddhi* that can become the possessor of *vivekajñāna*. Just as the purely unconscious Prakṛti is incapable of having such *viveka*, in the same manner, a pure Puruṣa, dissociated from *buddhi*, is not in a position to have this *vivekajñāna*. *Vṛttyātmaka-viveka* belongs to *buddhi* only. The *viveka* that belongs to Puruṣa is only *prākāśātmaka-viveka*, which implies simply the manifestation of two principles as different, and does not refer to an intellectual understanding and evaluation of the

distinction. Hence *prakāśātmaka-viveka* is not in contradiction with the indifference and neutrality of Puruṣa. Just as there is no distinction between *caitanya* and *cetana* in the philosophy of Sāṅkhya, so also there is no distinction between *viveka* and *vivekin*. *Vṛttyātmaka-viveka* belongs to Puruṣa only when it is associated with *buddhi*. Even then, such intellectual modifications are owned by Puruṣa through reflection only. Therefore, *vṛttyātmaka-viveka* is a seeming attribute of Puruṣa and a real attribute of *buddhi*. There is, therefore, no contradiction in describing Puruṣa both as *vivekin* (from the point of view of *prakāśa*) and indifferent.

The subjectivity of Puruṣa, again, refers simply to its power of receiving the reflection of *buddhi-vṛtti* that has assumed the form of an object. In other words, Puruṣa is a subject on account of the fact that it reveals naturally any object that happens to lie in its proximity. This *viṣaya-sambandha*, however, does not signify that Puruṣa is not indifferent. On the other hand, everybody will admit that consciousness, as mere revelation of objects, cannot be regarded as anything but neutral. The objects of the world are getting manifested by the light of the sun; but nobody will admit that, in respect of the objects which are manifested by the sun's rays, the attitude of the sun is anything but neutral. *Triguṇādi viparyayāt* means that Puruṣa is different from three *guṇas* which form the stuff of all the objects of enjoyment. In the bound condition also, the self refers to pure Consciousness only, and not to *buddhi*, even though it is the most powerful *jaḍa-prakāśa*. All the objects of the world are manifested by the intelligized *buddhi*, and all attributes, like agency, enjoyment of worldly experiences, purposefulness, the motive of evaluation, etc., belong only to the intellect, and not to the pure *Puruṣa*.

Here, we must also remember that, according to the Sāṅkhya, the true *Jiva* is not the *pratibimba-puruṣa*, which is destroyed in the state of emancipation. *Jiva* is Puruṣa, the consciousness of which is reflected in a particular *buddhi*. Hence

the arguments which establish the existence of the *jiva* also establish the existence of pure Puruṣa. Any attribute, like subjective, discriminating, etc., belongs to Puruṣa from the point of view of *prākaśa* only. Consciousness in the sense of pure *prakaśa* is always indifferent, non-agent, and neutral.

In regard to the third argument, Professor Vadekar says: 'This argument, most evidently, proves, if it proves anything, the agency of the Puruṣa, rather than its non-agency.'

Here, the argument simply seeks to prove that Puruṣa is intelligizing Prakṛti by its mere *sannidhi* so as to make Nature fit for the creation of this world. Puruṣa is not, therefore, becoming an agent; Puruṣa is the principle of consciousness that vitalizes Prakṛti by its mere existence (*sattā*). Brahman, too, is the *adhiṣṭhāna* of *māyā* ; but nobody imputes agency to Brahman on that account.

The fourth argument seeks to prove the *bhoktṛbhāva* of the Puruṣa that has already been connected with Nature through reflection. Enjoyment in the ordinary sense is not possible in the case of pure matter ; nor is it possible in the case of pure consciousness. It is only the seemingly unified category of Spirit and matter that becomes the enjoyer of worldly experiences. So, the Puruṣa that emerges from this argument, (when taken by itself) in its pure and unconnected form, must be admitted as neutral and indifferent, since pure consciousness can never be the subject of any kind of experience. Moreover, Vācaspati has explained the *bhoktṛbhāva* of Puruṣa in the sense of *draśṭṛbhāva* whereas Vijñānabhikṣu has interpreted *bhoktṛbhāva*, in the sense of enjoyment through reflection.

Further, enjoyment and indifference are not really two contradictory terms. They can go together. A *jāvanmukta* Puruṣa is indifferent to pleasures and pains ; still, he has to

go through pains and sufferings, as long as his *prārabdha-karma* is not wholly worked out.

The last argument seeks to prove the existence of Puruṣa on the basis of the observed facts of the world. In this world, we find that the whole of creation is marching towards freedom, which seems to be its supreme goal. Pure unconscious matter can never have the goal of freedom, which belongs to the soul. So, we are led to believe that there must be bound souls which are to be made free in and through this process of world creation. In other words, the world is marching towards the freedom of these souls. All desires and strivings belong to Prakṛti. The pure Self is not an agent. The winding up of the colourful net of Prakṛti is done by Prakṛti itsef, and not by Puruṣa. Bondage means a false unification of Consciousness with matter, and liberation means its dissociation. Unless there is *pravṛtti* in Nature, there will be no change and mutation, and consequently, the distinction of a static Prakṛti from a static Puruṣa cannot be fully realized. So, the argument that the strivings of Nature are for the purpose of emancipation (*kaivalyārtham pravṛteśca*) is quite logical from the dualistic standpoint of the Sāṁkhya metaphysics.

Thus, all the arguments given in the seventeenth *kārikā* do prove what they actually intend to prove (viz., the existence of Puruṣa as consciousness and illumination). It seems Professor Vadekar has not considered the Sāṁkhya with the care and sympathy that it deserves : otherwise he would not have raised such unfair objections against the philosophy of this school.

The Sāṁkhya philosophy of the multiplicity of selves, too, has been unsympathetically criticized by many modern critics. While making any criticism of the Sāṁkhya, we must remember that this doctrine, like the Nyāya, is a realistic system, and, as such, every fact of experience is in its

opinion, real and not illusory. Difference, for instance, is a felt experience, and hence it must be admitted as real. The difference between Spirit and matter, the difference between one material object and other, and the difference between one individual soul and another are all real facts. Hence these real facts must exist in all the levels of experience. The Advaita Vedānta believes in the falsity of difference, and so, all sorts of difference vanish in the air in the Advaita state of *mukti*. Now, if we make an attempt to interpret the Sāṁkhya with 'Advaita inclinations' in our mind, then, we are bound to meet with logical contradiction and irregularity at every step. For Advaita, *jivatva* produced by *buddhi*, *ahaṅkāra*, etc. is false. It is purely imaginary, while the only reality is the undivided Consciousness or Brahman. According to the Sāṁkhya, however, *buddhi*, *ahaṅkāra* etc. are not false. They are as real as consciousness. What is false is the relation of all these with Puruṣa. Since *buddhi*, *ahaṅkāra*, *vāsanā*, *saṁskāra*, etc. are all real, the differences created by all these causes in the empirical lives of the different individual souls are also real. Differences, which are noticed in the different reflections of different *buddhis*, are all real. Since the images or *pratibimbas* are different, the *bimbas* also must be different. Real distinction in effects can be produced by really distinct causes. In the empirical sphere, we find real difference among individuals, and this difference must therefore exist in the transcendental sphere as well. There are different *buddhis*, different *pratibimbas* or reflections, and different *bimbas* or Puruṣas. When a Puruṣa is finally liberated, the reflection is destroyed, and so, Puruṣa becomes fully dissociated from its *buddhi*, which then gets merged in Prakṛti. Diversity and multiplicity in creation are real, and these can be satisfactorily explained by assuming the existence of the different *avivekas* of the different Puruṣas. Created objects are many, and the selves that reveal these objects in different ways are also many.

If we hold that consciousness is one, and it falsely appears as many due to unreal investments (*upādhis*), then,

we shall not be able to do justice to the essentially realistic and dualistic position of the Sāṁkhya. Real difference in the *upādheya* can never be caused by mere difference in the limiting adjuncts. A man may put on different dresses at different times ; but this difference in his dresses will not cause any real difference in him. In the opinion of the dualistic and realistic Sāṁkhya, difference, in all its forms, is eternal. So, if difference is created by the non-eternal *upādhi*, then, with the destruction of the *upādhi*, difference, too, will vanish; and if difference is destroyed, the realistic and dualistic position of the Sāṁkhya cannot be maintained.

Further, it has been pointed out by some critics that qualitative identity cannot go with numerical plurality. If all selves are of the same nature, there can never be many selves, since there will be nothing to distinguish one Puruṣa from another. Now, if we reflect on this point carefully, we find just the opposite fact. Truly speaking, it is possible for us to have numerical plurality even without qualitative difference. In fact, qualitative identity loses its meaning unless there is numerical plurality. Unless there are at least two, there is no sense in asserting the existence of qualitative identity. The expression 'qualitative identity' can never be used if there is only one substance. This point has also been emphasized in the *Muktāvalitikā* of the *Bhāṣāpariccheda.*

Another objection is that, according to the Sāṁkhya, there is no difference among the selves in point of proximity to Prakṛti, due to which sorrows and sufferings happen to them. So, it follows that, when one self is afflicted with sorrow, all the other selves will be equally afflicted.

Here, we should remember that a self is not afflicted with sorrows and miseries due to *sannidhi* alone. Pleasures and pains occur to a Puruṣa on account of its *karmavāsanā*, which remains stored up in the *buddhi* with which it is associated from beginningless time. Enjoyment, therefore, is different for different selves. *Aviveka* creates a seeming

association of attachment and identification between Spirit and matter, and it is due to this sort of contact that a self goes through the experiences of pleasures and pains. When this *karmavāsanā* or *aviveka* of a particular self is destroyed, that self is liberated. If we consider the Sāṁkhya philosophy from this point of view, there will be no contradiction or irrationality in respect of the nature of Pure Puruṣa and its multiplicity.

THE NYAYA-VAISESIKA CONCEPTION OF SOUL

(A CRITICAL EXPOSITION)

In this article I propose to make a critical survey of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika conception of soul, which is a bold departure from the Upaniṣadic conception of the Ātman.

In India, soul is generally accepted as an eternal and permanent principle. All orthodox schools also agree that the soul is essentially pure and that in its pure form, it is never affected by any kind of worldly impurities. Further, sorrows and joys of life, pleasures and pains never form a real part of the ever pure self. The Ātman is distinct and different from the psycho-physical organism and its connection with the latter is only artificial or illusory. There is, however, no universal agreement among the different orthodox schools regarding the noumenal character of the Ātman. For the Sāṁkhya, the self is pure conciousness; for the Vedānta the self is pure conciousness, pure existence and pure bliss; and for the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, the soul is totally devoid of all qualities including consciousness.

According to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophers, there is no distinction between knowledge and consciousness. *Caitanya* is identical with *jñāna* or *buddhi*. The soul, dissociated from the psycho-physical organism, becomes dissociated from the instruments through which knowledge can be gathered. Hence in the disembodied condition the soul fails to have any kind of knowledge. Knowledge has origination and decay. Like all other non-eternal objects, it arises in the self from a conglomeration of conditions and when the conditions are disjointed, knowledge or consciousness immediately disappears. Ātman in its noumenal form is, thus, wholly unconscious and its relation with consciousness is only external and accidental.

Non-recognition of the identity between self and consciousness constitutes an important feature of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika realism. This is due to the fact that the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophy has recognized from the very beginning a distinction and not *Tādātmya* between the thing and its quality or essence. "Jar" as a substance is different and distinct from its red colour as well as from "jarness" which is its essence ; and both of them are related to it by the relation of inherence. The self as knower is also the substance which is characterized by knowledge. Our inner experience always takes the form of "I know", "I am pleased", "I am sorry" etc. Moreover, in inner perception the self is always revealed to us as the substratum of knowledge, volition, pleasures, pains etc. and is never identified with any form of experience.

Although the Naiyāyikas and the Vaiśeṣikas, like the Upaniṣadic sages, have admitted the existence of the transcendental and eternal self, yet they have used their own independent judgement while reducing this transcendental self to an indeterminate characterless abstraction which may be held to be equivalent to non-being or nothing. If we destroy all qualities of the self, including consciousness, the self itself seems to be destroyed.

The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika method of distinguishing and separating substance from its quality or essence and of holding substance to have a being independent of quality or essence seems to be guaranteed only by the evidence of uncritical experience of the common man. A careful analysis of experience of the world, however, reveals and affirms that quality or essence is identical with the thing or determines the character of a specific substance. What prevents a thing from vanishing into nothingness is its essence or determinateness and it is impossible for us to think of a thing or substance as different from its essence. The being of a jar consists solely in its "jarness" and the jar can never be thought of without "jarness". This essence, the

Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika have abstracted from the thing and then they have given it the name *Jāti*. This Jāti, in their opinion, is eternal and indestructible. "Jarness" existed before the creation of different jars and it will continue to exist even after the destruction of all jars.

Since in the case of the soul, they have applied the same method, the soul has been viewed as a substance in which the essence *Ātmatva* inheres. It is only when the soul comes in contact with the body and mind that qualities like *jñāna, iccha, prayatna, sukha, duḥkha* arise in it. Viewed critically, this theory seems to have treated the soul in the same manner in which an ordinary material object has been treated even though these philosophers have tried hard to preserve a definite line of distinction between their view of the soul and that of the materialistic school. They have refuted emphatically the view that body is identical with the soul. Had consciousness resided in the body, we could have found this quality even in a dead body. As this never happens in this world, the body must not be regarded as the substratum of consciousness. The materialistic contention that consciousness resides in a living body, has been rejected by these philosophers, as in that case we shall not be able to explain the continuity of consciousness as well as memory. The body is continually becoming new. The body of childhood is not the same as the body of the youth, and the body that one has in his old age is different from the body that he had in his childhood. If consciousness is a quality of the body, then it also will change constantly and, therefore, there will be intermittent breaks in the continuity of conscious life, which in turn will impair memory. Even mind cannot be regarded as the substratum of consciousness. Mind is atomic, and if knowledge had been a property of the mind, then it would also have been atomic and therefore non-perceptible in nature, which really is not true. Both body and mind are thus found to be unsuitable for serving as the substratum of knowledge. The soul, in their opinion

is also eternal. A new-born baby starts sucking its mother's breasts without going through any course of training. This the baby can do simply because it had learnt this activity in some prior births. On the basis of such facts, the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophers establish the existence of an eternal and permanent soul in which *Samskāras* of the previous births remain stored up from a beginningless time and which passes through a series of births and deaths till it is finally liberated.

Thus, so far as these characteristics of eternality and permanence of the soul and also its bondage, liberation and transmigration are concerned, we do not find any radically new idea in the philosophy of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school. It is only in respect of the noumenal nature of the soul that the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school adds a new note which is not in keeping with the Upaniṣadic tradition. If we search deeply for the cause, it will perhaps not be very difficult for us to trace it out in the multicoloured soil of our own motherland.

The Nyāya philosophy developed gradually in course of its fight against the Buddhistic philosophy. It was therefore not unlikely that in its resistance against this *Avaidikā* religion, it had accepted (perhaps unconsciously) many thoughts and ideas of Buddhism which were appealing to them. From the second century A. D., upto the eleventh century A. D., the Buddhistic thoughts were prominent; and because of the rational and catholic spirit of Buddhism it was popular among the people. The important task of refuting the anti-Vedic arguments of the Buddhistic school was taken up by the Naiyāikas. *Sūnyavāda* was criticized in the Nyāya-Sūtras. Nyāya-Vārtikā was written by Uddyotakara with a view to refuting the charges of Dignaga and Vasubandhu. The most remarkable *Avaidikā* feature of Buddhism figured prominently in the form of the Pudgala-Nairātmya-vāda of this school, and this was the doctrine that became the target of criticisms from all other orthodox schools of philosophy and religion. So far as egoity and personality are concerned, we find that all orthodox schools agree with Buddhism in holding that these

are due to ignorance and that these are also the root causes of all worldly pains and miseries. The psychological self is fictitious, unreal and therefore non-permanent. The first step towards *Mokṣa*, therefore, consists in the realization of the unreality of this psychological and personal ego. The ego and individuality have got to be transcended in order to reach spiritual perfection. While Sāṁkhya-Yoga and the Vedānta idealism admit the existence of a permanent self as transcendental consciousness which serves as the uniting principle of all knowledge and phenomenal thinking, the Buddhists refuse to recognize any such eternal principle of consciousness and reduce self to momentary states and processes of phenomenal consciousness of our empirical life. The denial of permanent consciousness and recognition of impermanence and change in the realm of psychical phenomena seem to constitute common features of both Buddhism and Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophy. Judging the importance of the Buddhistic thoughts and ideas with which the philosophical atmosphere of that period was highly charged, we may infer that the essentially logical minds of the Naiyāyikas and the Vaiśeṣikas did discover a layer of truth in the Buddhistic denial of permanent consciousness. If we analyse consciousness, we actually find nothing but mutable psychical states appearing in the forms of knowledge, desires, will, pleasures, pains etc. These are the contents of our self and these are not stationary and eternal. They appear and disappear due to the operation of their generative and annihilative conditions. Soul as pure transcendental consciousness can never be demonstrated in actual experience. We never become aware of the dual nature of consciousness, one phenomenal and the other transcendental. In fact, if we make a distinction beween permanent consciousness of self and mutable knowledge or Buddhi (as is done by the Sāṁkhya and the advaita Vedānta), then we shall have to admit that in one and the same body, two different forms of consciousness, belonging to two different orders, exist at the same time. Yet nobody is aware of this

duality. Such a position does not seem to be justifiable from the Nyāya point of view.

These philosophers have, however, maintained their orthodox attitude by denying emphatically the Buddhistic doctrines of momentariness and *pratītyasamutpāda* in every sphere, including the sphere of consciousness. Production and destruction are correlatives to increase and decrease; (*upacaya* and *apacaya*) and increase as well as decrease can happen to things only if they last for more than one moment. If a thing is momentary, then increase and decrease which need different points of time, can never be predicated of it. It is only a thing having *Sthāyitva* (duration for some time) that can increase at one moment and decrease at another. So, though consciousness is unsteady and impermanent, it does not last for one moment only. Both momentariness and *pratītyasamutpāda* favour the maxim : "*Asataḥ Sat-utpadyate*", which goes against all empirical evidence. If *Asat* can be the cause of *Sat*, then we ought to have seedlings from the seeds which have been reduced to powder. The causal relation of succession, advocated by the Buddhists was however accepted by the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school, but they have preserved the Upaniṣadic tradition by holding the causal view of *Bhāvāt bhāvotpattiḥ*. An effect for them is always the result of the operation of three forms of causal factors which function together in such a manner that from their joint operation a new phenomenon comes into existence. One form of causal factor is called *samavāyi-kāraṇa* or that which is capable of producing an effect which inheres in it.

Samavāyi kāraṇa is either of the nature of the component parts or of the nature of the substratum in which the effect inheres. Knowledge or consciousness, being and effect, must have a *samavāyi kāraṇa* or substratum and this substratum is the soul. Here knowledge arises from a combined functioning of soul, mind, sense-organs and object and if any of these factors becomes inoperative, consciousness fails to appear. Consciousness as an effect is different from each one

of the causal factors, although it is dependent on them. The essentially realistic minds of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika seem to have taken here a very bold step, and unlike any other traditional theory based on the Upaniṣadic conception of pure consciousness, have declared that consciousness is only a mutable product and accidental quality of the soul and that it is dependent on the object. Consciousness unrelated to an object is an absurdity. Thus the object here is not a modified form of consciousness. On the contrary, the importance of consciousness has been deliberately minimized by making it dependent on the object.

Here, the question arises : Does the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system fare well in the field of philosophy by recognizing the reality of a characterless and unconscious soul ? The answer cannot be given in the affirmative. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika hypothesis that knowledge is a separable quality of an unconscious soul-substance and that it can arise only in relation to an external object, goes against the evidence of experience in the sense that it fails to make adequate provision for the self-conscious nature of human thought. Moreover, the complete separation between self and consciousness has given almost a materialistic colour to the metaphysics of these two schools. If the soul substance in its pure form is totally devoid of consciousness then how are we to distinguish and differentiate it from another inert unconscious substance like a jar ?

Of course, the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophers will answer this criticism by saying that the self differs from a so-called material object in the sense that while in a material object, there is *atyantābhāva* of consciousness, it is not so in the case of self. If this reply is judged critically, then also, we have to admit that "self" possesses an inseparable and in-distinguishable character (essence) different from the physicality of the so-called material objects. This essence or inseparable character is identical with the thing and it is only by virtue of this essential quality that a substance is distinguished

either as material or as spiritual. If "Jarness" is separable from the "Jar" and *Ātmatva* from the Ātman, then in their pure forms (i. e. abstracted from their essences) they will never be distinguishable from each other. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas have identified knowledge with consciousness but they have preserved the word *Ātmatva* to connote the essential quality of the Ātman. Now what does the word *Ātmatva* stand for ? If it means *Cetanatva*, then the soul will be a conscious substance even in its pure form : as being a *Nitya-dravya*, it will never be separated from its *jāti* or essence. In that case, the Naiyāyikas and the Vaiśeṣikas too must be prepared to recognize two forms of consciousness, one phenomenal and one noumenal. But if *Ātmatva* is not identified with *Cetanatva* thereby making *Cetanatva* a non-separable quality of the soul, then there will be no means at the disposal of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophers to save their metaphysics from falling into the dark abyss of materialism. This is a point which needs much careful analysis and very critical reflections ; and it seems to me that there is still much scope for research work in this direction. Such a research will surely be able to throw more light on the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika conception of soul.

ŚŪNYA-VĀDA IN NYĀYA-SŪTRA—
A CRITICAL EXPOSITION

Early Buddhism which started in the teachings of Lord Buddha, had received the most logical treatment in the "Śūnyatā" doctrine of the Mādhyamika school, founded by Nāgārjuna in the second century A. D. From the 2nd century A. D. up to the ninth century A. D. Buddhism was the most powerful religious force in India and during this period Buddhism had reached the zenith of high admiration and intellectual glory. The popularity and high intellectual attainments of the Buddhistic philosophy naturally aroused vehement opposition from various quarters and all orthodox schools began to attack this system from different points of view. "Śūnyavāda", which is regarded as the central teaching of Buddhism, was severely criticised in the 'Nyāya-Sūtra.'

The object of this article is to make a critical review of some of these criticisms which were levelled against the "Śūnya-vāda" doctrine of the Mādhyamika school by the realistic Naiyāyikas of the orthodox Hindu-fold.

The Naiyāyikas, as we all know, represent the realistic school and they are out to establish the reality of the external world on logical grounds. Naturally, therefore, the maxim "Sarvam Śūnyam" is repugnant to them. To them the world is such that we can see, feel and touch it every day in our routine-life. How can we, they ask, deny the reality and existence of this diversely and continuously experienced world ? They go further and hold that the positive and concrete objects of the world are continuously and forcefully stimulating the intellect of human beings and that they are being thought of and reflected upon by different individuals in all ages, in all places and at all times. These facts, they maintain, prove the reality of the external world which is the

constant object of our intellectual apprehension and consideration. A wholly unreal thing like the hare's horn can never become an object of intellectual consideration.

The "Śūnyavādins" have referred to the relative nature of all appearances in order to prove their unreality or essencelessness.[1] That alone can be called an essence or reality which can exist by itself. Nāgārjuna has said : "That which comes from *Hetu* and cannot remain without the *pratyayas*, and ceases to be in the absence of the *pratyayas*, cannot be regarded as existent. As there is only *Pratitya-samutpāda* or dependent origination, there must be the lack of intrinsic nature. The cloth remains in the threads and is relative to and non-separable from the threads. How can we then say that the cloth is real or has an independent nature of its own ? Such is the case with all phenomena which are subject to *Pratitya-samutpāda* without exception, No phenomenon can originate from itself or can be understood by itself. Nothing, therefore can be accepted as real. Śūnyatā is the logical culmination of *Pratityā-samutpāda* which reigns supreme in this phenomenal world".

The *Śūnyavādi* attitude of the Mādhyamika school has been criticised in the 'Nyāya-Sūtra'. According to the school of 'Nyāya-Sūtra' mutual relativity involves the fallacy of *arguing in a circle.** If "greater" is relative to less, then "less" cannot be relative to "greater", as relativity from both sides is logically unsound. If one at least is admitted as non-relative, then "Sarvaśūnya-vāda" falls to the ground. Moreover, a phenomenon is relative to and non-separable from its "Samavāyi-kāraṇa" (Āśraya) not because it is unreal, but because of the peculiar relation that exists between every cause and its effect. The Samavāyi-kāraṇa is the Upādāna and the effect is the "upādeya". Whatever is an "upādeya" can never be anywhere else than in its own "upādāna" and must be relative to it. So when we think of cloth or perceive cloth

[1]Nyāya-Sūtra—39, Chap. 4 Anhika—1

*Parasparāśraya doṣaḥ

in actual life, we always find it inhering in its cause—the threads. This inherence of the effect in the cause does not, however, prove its unreality, as the effect, being a new creation, is always experienced as distinct and different from the cause serving a different end. Again this relation of relativity and non-separableness (which has been made the present ground for proving unreality of objects) does not exist between any two things. It exists only between a Samavāyi-kāraṇa and its effect. "Jar" is not dependent on "cloth" nor is cloth relative to "Jar". These two are distinct and different having no relation of mutual dependence between them. "Jar" and "Cloth" are always experienced as two things, independent of each other. Further we find that different forms of "Buddhi" are needed to experience different concrete objects. "Jar" can be experienced by perceptual intellect (Pratyakṣa-buddhi) whereas atoms can be known only by inferential intellect (Anumānabuddhi). If all things possess the same Śūnya-nature, then they should all be apprehended by the same form of intellect. Differences in intellect prove distinctions among objects and that proves their reality. So Śūnya or void cannot be the ultimate truth.

On pragmatic grounds also, the reality of objects can be established* (1) We make a "jar" from a lump of clay, use it in bringing water, drink that water and thus we quench our thirst. Had these concrete things been illusory, we could not have fulfilled so many of our everyday purposes with their help. *Asat* (or mere negation) can never give us any real fruitful experience. Again, if we accept the maxim "Sarvam Śūnyam", then we shall not be able to recognise the reality of "Pramāṇas" even for establishing "Śarva-Śūnya-vāda and in the absence of a real "pramāṇa", the doctrine of Śūnya-vāda cannot be established. If on the other hand "pramāṇa" is admitted to be real, then we cannot say that "Śūnya" or void. is the ultimate truth. At least Pramāṇa will not be "Śūnya" or void. Further

*Prasannapadākhya Vyākhya by Sudarsanacharyya on Sūtra 29, Chap. 4 Anhika-1.

if 'Sarva-Śūnyatva' can be established without the help of any "pramāṇa", then the same procedure may also be adopted to establish the reality of "Sarva-padārtha"[1](2).

The upholders of Śūnya-vāda compare everyday experiences of our waking life with the illusory experiences of our dreams. Just as in dreams, unreal objects can be experienced as real, in the same way, in our waking life, we have experinces of objects, although in reality there are no such things. This can also be compared with the tricks of an able magician who gives us experiences of various things which are fictitious and wholly unreal. The contention of the 'Nyāya-Sūtras' is that these dream objects too are not wholly unreal[2](3). Dream-objects are, indeed, the memory-images of the objects experienced during waking life. It is because these dream objects are not generally experienced in the same way in waking life that they are called unreal. Dream-objects vanish as soon as the dreamer gets up from his sleep. Further, if non-experience of dream-objects in waking life proves their voidness, then the experience of objects in waking life also should prove their reality. Variety in dream experiences, again, cannot be explained if we accept the theory of Śūnya. Diversity in effects is always due to diversity in causal conditions. If there is nothing but *Śūnya*, then Śūnya should be the cause of every thing : from an identical cause, we can never have diversity of effects.

Here the followers of the Nyāya-Sūtras apprehended an objection from the side of their opponents. The opponents may say that if the dream-object is only a memory-image of the object experienced in waking life, then it should not be regarded as unreal. In answering this objection, it has been stated in the 'Nyāya-Sūtra' that the dream-objects are regarded as unreal only because they are not experienced by the dreamer when he wakes up from his sleep. Otherwise, all the materials of the dream-experiences are gathered from the

[1] Nyāya-Sūtra—30, Chap. 4, Anhika—2.

[2] Nyāya-Sūtra—34, Chap. 4, Anhika—2.

diverse experiences of his waking life. Dream-objects as objects are not unreal ; they appear as unreal because of the peculiar dream-situation in which they are perceived.

The *Sūnyavādins* often say that just as the experience of our waking life invalidates our dream-knowledge, in the same manner, the empirical knowledge of our waking-life can be proved to be false by the higher knowledge of the ultimate truth.

Here, the followers of the 'Nyāya-Sūtras' have taken much pain to show that knowledge of ultimate truth can destroy only the false intellect and cannot prove the unreality of the objects of our practical life. A real object is sometimes known in a wrong manner due to certain prevailing conditions. When true knowledge arises it is the false knowledge that disappears immediately, leaving the object untouched. The real object remains as such and nothing happens actually to wipe it out from existence. When pieces of detached clouds assemble together in the sky in a particular form and order, we get the vision of a "Gandharva-Nagar" on the blue canopy. This creation is due to the operation of "mithhyā buddhi," or false intellect. True knowledge of so many pieces of clouds destroys this deceiving intellect at once, whereas clouds as clouds remain in the sky with no change in their being.

Again, we normally recognise two forms of knowledge—true and false. In the case of magic, for example, we find that the magician possesses true knowledge about the nature of his magic-wand and skill; but the knowledge of the audience regarding those things is false. The person who sees the mirage as mirage from a close quarter possesses true knowledge of it, but the person who sees the mirage from a distance perceives it as a lake and thus his knowledge of it is false. Hence we find that everybody makes such a distinction and accepts the reality of true knowledge. The "Sūnya-vadins", therefore, cannot say that all things of this world are "Sūnya" or nothing.

While making a critical review of all these criticisms of the "Nyāya-Sūtra", we may point out that the Nyāya philosophers have not been able to understand the real meaning of the word "Sūnya" and, therefore, they have failed to be fair and just in their criticisms against the Mādhyamika school. Sūnya, when used in the literatures of the Mādhyamika school, connotes something entirely different from its ordinary sense. When interpreted in relation to the world, "Sūnya", in Mādhyamika literatures, refers to the relative and conditional nature of this phenomenal creation.[5]

The Sūnyavādins have followed the middle path between eternalism and nihilism or between absolute reality and absolute unreality. So far as the phenomenal world is concerned, it is neither absolutely real nor absolutely unreal : it is only relative and conditional (Pratītya samutpannam vasturūpam samvṛtti ucyate). Absolutely real is that which is independent and absolutely unreal is that which is fictitious and has no being in the true sense, such as sky-flower or hare's horn. In between these two, there is, however, a third category (Sūnya) which stands for conditional and relative realities. In the 'Advaita Vedānta', this third category is described as "Anirvacanīya". As the world is a world of conditional realities or appearances the world is called 'Śūnya' by the Mādhyamika school. They have never denied the empirical reality of this phenomenal world. In the Mādhyamika Kārikā it has been stated very clearly that nobody will be able to reach the ultimate goal, if he neglects altogether the empirical truth of this phenomenal world. It is only through the lower that we can go to the higher. (Vyavahāram anāsṭtya paramārtho na deśyate). We do have constant intercourse with the objects of the world and they do possess reality : but this reality is only a dependent reality,—the posterior event depending on the prior event. Since, all the so-called things of the world are related, they are all mutually dependent

[5]Mādhyamikā Kārikā XXIV-18
Mahāyānavimśaka :—Kārikās—3 & 13.

and relative and on that account are essenceless or 'Śūnya'. So runs the maxim "Sarvam Śūnyam".

The sensible world is a causally dependent world. Here we find a free reign of casuality everywhere. What is produced from a cause possesses only a conditional nature and it is this conditionality or relativity that constitutes the real meaning of the word : "Śūnya". Śūnya does not mean "asat" or mere negation. Even a "jar" that satifies our practical needs is dependent on its cause and this dependent nature of the "jar" will be accepted even by the followers of the 'Nyāya-sūtra'. When the Naiyāyikas say that a "jar" which is "asat" can never satisfy a real need, they mean by "asat" pure non-being or "abhāva". When the Śūnyavādins say that the "jar" is Śūnya, they refer only to its dependent nature. As meanings are entirely different in these two cases, the fight of the Naiyāyikas over the word "Śūnya" is absolutely ill-conceived and illogical.

Of course, "Śūnyavādins" have often taken as examples mirage, dream and illusion to prove 'Śūnyata' of the empirical world : but these examples should not be interpreted too liberally. The most important task before the 'Śūnyavādins' was to save people from an over-dose of materialism which was creating a hell in the philosophical atmosphere of our country. The extremists of the materialistic school had demolished all distinction between soul and matter and had undermined the importance of all values of life. In fact, it developed into a theory of "Śarīravāda" and gross sensualism and held a natural charm for the general public who were after the joys of life and pleasures of the senses. The world was so near and dear to them that it was not a very easy task for the Buddhists to convince these people about the ultimate unreality of all worldly things. Even to-day, many of us will refuse straightway to admit that the world is not absolutely real. To accomplish this difficult task in that age, the Mādhyamika philosophers wisely selected such examples from our daily life which everybody would accept as unreal. There

is indeed no loophole in any of these examples through which even a faint faith in the reality of the world can cast its influence on our mind. Hence, with the help of these examples, the Śūnya-vādī philosophers had tried to establish emphatically the ultimate unreality of the phenomenal world which was their chief aim. The followers of the 'Nyāya-Śūtra' have admitted that the dream-objects are not wholly real or wholly unreal, since the materials are collected from the experiences of our waking life. If this be the case, then the dream-phenomena should be the best things to be compared with the empirical world which is also neither wholly real nor wholly unreal.

In conclusion, it may be stated that it is definitely wrong to hold that the Mādhyamika school does not believe in the existence of any "tattva" except pure negation. The Mādhyamika Kārikā defines "Tattva" as that which can be known directly, that which is unruffled, that which is not coloured by plurality, and that which is Nirvikalpa and Anānārtha. This *tattva* is the non-dual absolute truth and it is beyond the reach of intellect. As the absolute reality is not coloured by plurality it may also be called "Śūnya" in the sense of 'prapanca-śūnya. In his "Indian Philosophy", Dr. Chandra Dhar Sharma has justly said that the word 'Śūnya' is used in a double sense in the Mādhyamika literatures. "It means the relative as well as the absolute. It means relativity as well as reality." The so-called phenomena of the world are "svabhāva-śūnya" or devoid of ultimate reality, and reality is "prapanca-śūnya" or devoid of plurality.

The Nyāya-contention that the 'Śūnyavādins were negativisits who were out to preach an absurd doctrine of 'Pure Negation' is unjust and inappropriate. It was the literal meaning of the word "Śūnya" that had caused all these misunderstandings and misrepresentations and had also retarded the growth of Buddhistic philosophy in India.

THE CENTRAL CORE OF BUDDHIST PHILOSOPHY

The world according to Buddhism, is full of suffering and pain, disease, decay and death, and there is no getting out of these. This essentially painful nature of life was what awakened Buddha to seek a way out of it. He was not satisfied with the current philosophies of his age.

The most outstanding contribution which Buddha made to Indian philosophy was the discovery of the mutual dependence of things found in this world, which dependence again is a mark of unreality because all things of the world, including the "self" are subject to the laws of change, relativity and mutual dependence. This law of the relative existence of things and their mutual dependence is expressed in the doctrine of *pratityā samutpāda* or "dependent origination" which forms the central core of Buddhist philosophy. Nothing is permanent, nothing endures even for two moments together ; there are only diverse series of changes ; things do not exist with any essence in them, they exist only as causal relatives ; there being certain phenomena, there happen to be some others.

Causation in Buddhism always needs more than one condition. Nothing results from a single factor only. Thus Buddhism has made a distinction between *hetu* which ordinarily refers to the primary cause, and *pratyaya* which accompanies favourable conditions. In the case of a seedling, for example, the seed is the *hetu* ; and earth, water, heat, light etc. (without which the seedling cannot come up) are the *pratyayas*. The whole of this phenomenal world, according to Buddhism, is merely a playground of primary and secondary causes.

According to Buddhism, creations of all things and beings of the world take place in a continuous causal series in the

past, present and future. There is a ceaseless flow of elements and incessant becomings. The continuous temporal flow can be divided into twelve divisions, and these twelve divisions, being mutually dependent, form the twelve limbs of *pratītya samutpāda,* and the whole of this twelve divisioned cycle is called the wheel of life. As the wheel is revolving continuously, it is impossible for us to ascertain which one of the twelve limbs is really the first cause.

Some understanding of the twelve limbs, and the order in which they are usually enumerated may help us to grasp the implications of *pratītya-samutpāda*. The first is *avidyā*, ignorance, which means that it is the activity of the past life, done under the spell of greed, aversion and wrong knowledge that directly leads to the emergence of the present life. It is because of wrong knowledge and wrong perspective of things that one regards worldly objects as permanent and runs after them, thereby giving a constant push to the wheel of life to take more and more rounds of birth and death. This ignorance leads to the second limb viz., *saṁskāra* or the effect of the blind activity of the past life. The effect of the activity of the past life acts as the energy to bring forth a new life and a new series of existence. *Vijñāna,* the third limb, means embryonic consciousness. It arises at the first moment of conception. This *vijñāna* then takes one more step and becomes the cause of *nāma-rūpa*, the fourth limb, or the mind-body of embryonic life. The *six sense organs* develop in the next stage as the fifth limb but they are not used in the embryonic stage, *Sparśa* or contact, the sixth limb, refers to the early stage of infancy when the sense-organs of the newly formed life begin to come in touch with the objects of this world. *Vedanā*, the seventh limb, means the feelings of pleasure, pain and indifference. When the individual grows in age, he becomes familiar with the feelings of pleasures and pains. By *sparśa.* he gains knowledge of the external world whereas *vedanā* awakens him to feel and enjoy various emotions of life. *Desire*, the eighth limb, depends on *vedanā*. When

the individual experiences pleasure, he grows eager to have this feeling again and again in his life. This is the stage of desire and it breeds attachment. It is the pursuit of desire that leads a man astray and weaves around him a net-work of births and deaths, miseries and sufferings. *Upādāna,* the ninth limb, means clinging to existence or making efforts to retain the object of pleasure. *Upādāna* produces *bhava* or the will to be, the tenth limb. An individual will not be able to experience the pleasures of life unless he is born. "The will to be" thus becomes the ground of our repeated existences. So *bhava* leads to *jāti,* birth, the eleventh limb which produces the twelfth and last limb viz. old age, death, sorrows etc.

These are the twelve factors considered by Buddhism as being responsible for the emergence of life and its variegated sense-experiences and emotions. These different stages are knitted together as if in a chain and every prior stage is the ground of the posterior one. So long as we remain in darkness and ignorance, the wheel remains in motion and whenever there is conflict and maladjustment, the wheel moves with jerks and as a consequence we become discontented and unhappy. The past, present and future are linked together in such a way that while enjoying in the present life the fruits of the past, one sows seeds for the future. Time does not flow in a straight line. It moves in a circle with no beginning or end. Death does not mean the end of life. Withering away of one life means the blossoming forth of another. When one series finishes, a new series at once springs up. *Saṃsāra* means series of lives moving in circles. Each wheel is a small circle of one life and the series of the wheel of life is *saṃsāra.*

The view that everything changes from moment to moment is known as the doctrine of momentariness. This doctrine too has been elaborately developed in Buddhist philosophy and religion. The whole world is a flux and everything is

being continually renewed. Nothing stands, nothing abides. There is no substance, either spiritual or material, that is not a particle of the ever-changing and ever-flowing stream. One moment bursts forth, vanishes and is immediately replaced by the next one which also disappears and makes room for the emergence of the subsequent one. In other words, there is only a series of moments and no permanent or eternal being. There is only the way of becoming, and there is no being that becomes. That everything in the phenomenal world is dynamic and ever-changing was recognised in India long before Buddha came. But while some of his predecessors held that the soul or some spiritual substance is permanent, eternal and not subject to the law of change, the Buddhists did not make any exception even with regard to it. There is, they said, only a series of momentarily existing psychical states and no abiding soul-substance. This, however, presents a problem. If there is no permanent individual, how can there be any relation between an individual, his action and its consequences ? One performs an action at one moment, but he changes the next moment when the results of the action are experienced. How then are we to regard that person as the enjoyer of the fruits of his past deeds ? In the same way, the person who experiences the consequences cannot have been the doer of the action, both the movements being different. It also follows from the above that an action, actually performed, does not produce any result as it is momentary in nature, and that while there is the result, there is in fact no action at all. Buddhism has tried to solve this difficulty in a manner which would appear to be logical. Although it is a fact that the succeeding moment comes into being when the preceding moment is destroyed, there is a very important relation between the two. It is only because the preceding moment is there, that the succeeding one comes into being. This relation is the relation of *pratītya-samutpāda* or dependent origination. Moments run in a series and are, no doubt, different. Still,

because the preceding one happening, the succeeding one happens, there is a sort of continuity of distinct moments flowing in a series without a break, in which each succeeding moment inherits some characteristics of the preceding one. Thus we find different streams of life flowing in different directions and each stream is different from every other stream, bearing a particular name of its own. The life of "A" is one series and It is different from the series called "B". At every moment in "A" life, action is being performed, and the natnre of the action of one moment is determining the nature of life of the subsequent moment, and in this manner actions are producing their consequences. The body of a man is always changing. The body that one has in his infancy changes as he becomes a boy: the boy then grows into a man and his body is different. Still, we overlook these changes and regard the series as one. The conception of unity or identity is merely subjective, being the product of our imagination polluted by ignorance. Nevertheless, this idea of unity arises because of the fact that the body of childhood is derived from the body of infancy. Therefore, the child is not free from the influences of the actions performed during infancy.

It is interesting to note that this "no soul" theory found an echo in the West in the 18th century in the writings of David Hume, to whom also, the self meant nothing but a series of successive mental states, there being no permanent soul-substance.

The principle of *pratītya-samutpāda* receives a magnificent handling in the writings of the Śūnyavādins according to whom, things of the world are mere appearances without any essence in them. The word *Śūnyatā* is used to imply that the phenomena of this empirical world have no intrinsic nature of their own. The essencelessness of all appearances, the Śūnya-vādins, say, can be proved by the principle of *pratītya-samutpāda*. That alone can be called an essence which can exist by itself.

Since all the so-called things of the world are related, they are all mutually dependent and relative, and on that account are essenceless and unreal. Nāgārjuna, the great propagator of the doctrine of *Sunyatā*, has said : "That which comes from *hetu* and cannot remain without the *pratyayas*, and ceases to be in the absence of the *pratyayas*, cannot be regarded as existent." *Śūnyatā* is the logical culmination of *pratītya-samutpāda*. If there is only reciprocity and mutual dependence, there must be the lack of intrinsic nature. We cannot accept *pratītyā-samutpāda* and deny *Śūnyatā* as both of them are logically identical. Thus a single stroke of *pratītya-samutpāda* is enough to reduce the whole world to a mere show of appearances and phenomena with no substratum of their own. All phenomena are like dream images, fictitious and a false show without any real nature. Even *pratītya-samutpāda*, being a relation of the phenomenal world, is false and unreal. Just as in the West, the empiricism of Locke found its most logical development in the writings of Hume, so early Buddhist teachings based on the principle of *pratītya-samutpāda* received the most logical interpretation in the *Śunyatā* doctrine of the Mādhyamika school, founded by Nāgārjuna (2nd cent. A.D.).

The twelve-divisional wheel of life, as we have seen, is ordinarily supposed to begin with ignorance or *avidyā*. *Avidyā* through certain intermediary links, leads to desire which in its turn brings about the clinging to existence. Desire, therefore, plays an important part in creating bondage. Due to ignorance, one wrongly perceives the truth and attaches permanent value to things which are not really in existence. By doing so, one thinks evil to be good ; naturally, there arises desire for the attainment of seeming good and seeming pleasures. Once such desire is aroused, it leads one astray bringing about one's ruin. When an action is performed under the influence of greed and attachment, that action becomes the cause of bondage and suffering. Karma, in fact, is nothing but volition or mental action even if it is not a physical one.

Mind is actually the inmost recess of all actions and there is no Karma without thought. Selfish action causes bondage whereas disinterested action springing forth from universal love and goodwill, loosens the bond of worldly existence. When bondage comes to an end, one rises above the plane of *pratītya samutpāda* and does not bring into existence any other being for rebirth.

It would appear from the above that *pratītya-samutpāda* is really the logic on which the entire Buddhist philosophy is based. The doctrines of momentariness and no-soul would not have made any impression on men's intellect and emotion had they not been supported by the principle of dependent origination. A number of different moments, wholly unconnected would have resulted only in a disorganised bundle and not in a well-ordered universe. The seed and the seedling are two different phenomena. Had there been no relation of dependence between them, we could not have expected to get the seedling out of a seed and could not have been able to think of them in a definite order. We are able to do so, simply because there is the relation of dependent origination. The term *pratītya-samutpāda* is very suggestive. We never perceive causal force in operation, nor have we any experience of causal transition. What we see in this world is that some thing comes into existence, leaves an effect and dies out. In other words, we can say, the cause-phenomenon being there, the effect-phenomenon comes into existence. The Buddhist who believes in "non-soul" is able to explain the efficacy of Karma, rebirth and moral responsibility, simply by the theory that the posterior moments being dependent on the prior once, seem to inherit something similar to those of the past ; otherwise they would have failed to satisfy the human intellect and reason just as it happened in the West with David Hume. Hume agrees with Buddhism in holding that there is no permanent substance, either spiritual or material. Buddhism, however, holds that all the distinct existences are rigidly conditioned as to their nature and form

by the *apriori* law of dependent origination, whereas it is not so with Hume's philosophy. Although Hume has tried to strengthen his metaphysical position by accepting the empirical laws of association and custom, yet these laws being themselves empirical in origin, create only paradoxes and do not act as real cementing forces as Hume wished them to be. In Buddhism, however, these notions of substance and causality being due to *avidyā*, are *apriori*. These are universally operative in the empirical world, although they have no application in trans-empirical state of Nirvāna. Thus Buddhism has given us not only the doctrine of "non-soul" but has also a very consistent logic in the form of *pratītya-samutpāda* to support it.

SAMKARA AND RAMANUJA: A COMPARATIVE STUDY*

All forms of Vedāntic teachings are grounded on the truth that the supreme reality is Brahman or Ātman. Difference arises only in regard to the status of the individual soul and the world. Are individuality of the individual and materiality of matter real or false ? If real, what sort of relation can justifiably be supposed to exist between Brahman and either of the two categories, i. e., spirit and matter. These are the problems which have led to the division of the Vedanta philosophy into different branches, such as non-dualism, qualified non-dualism, dualism and non-dualism etc.

The object of this paper is to make a comparative study of the views of Śaṁkara and Ramānuja in respect of Brahman with a view to discovering how far these apparently rival theories can be brought close to one another.

Brahman According to Śāmkara

According to Śaṁkara, self or pure consciousness has been admitted as the Ultimate Reality. This consciousness is self-revealing, infinite, eternal, devoid of difference, qualityless, formless and unchangeable. If consciousness is not supposed to be self-revealing in nature, then for the revelation of consciousness, we shall have to assume the existence of some other principle of revelation which, again, will be in need of the third one and so on to infinity. That which depends on something other than its own self for revealing is inert (jaḍa). All things, other than Consciousness are revealed by Consciousness and so, in the opinion of Śaṁkara, all things except pure Consciousness are inert and false.

---

*Paper read at the Indology Section of XXVI International Congress of orientalists held in New Delhi on 8th January 1964.

Consciousness as Sat (Existence)

Consciousness is of the nature of existence because prior non-existence of Consciousness (jñāna prāgabhāva) cannot be thought of. If we try to understand the prior non-existence of Consciousness, we can only do that with the help of Consciousness. Consciousness, therefore, is not different from being or existence. The self-revealing Consciousness is the self and the not-self is what depends on the self for revelation. It is because the soul is of the nature of existence and consciousness that nobody raises doubt regarding its existence[1].

Consciousness as Bliss

Pure Consciousness, which is the same as the soul is also of the form of bliss, because the ultimate source of all pleasures is the self or ātman. Anything that belongs to my Self is dear to me[2]. So the ātman which makes all things pleasurable and loveable is the real and infinite bliss (Bhūmānanda).

Self as Brahman

The soul which is of the nature of existence, consciousness and bliss is identified with Brahman, the Great. That which is manifested outwardly as the universe, resides in the innermost recess of the human heart as soul[3]. It is because Brahman is of the nature of Infinite bliss that the Śruti has stated : "Yo vai bhūmā tat sukham, yo vai bhūmā tat amṛtaṁ Bṛahma" (That which is infinite is bliss, that which is infinite is immortal Brahma)

---

1. B. V.—11-3-7
2. Bṛhad Upaniṣad—4-5-6.
3. Sarvasyātmatvāt ca Brahmāstitva prasiddhiḥ. B. Ś 1-1. Samastasya viṣayjātasya pratisedhādaviṣayaḥ pratyagātmā Brahmeti jijñāsā nivartate. B. S. 111-2-23.

The pure Saccidānanda form of Brahman cannot be realised fully in the life of an ignorant man. This is because in waking life as well as in dream-life, the non-dual nature of the self is never revealed.

In the state of deep slee, however, this non-dual nature of the self is revealed for a short while, but that too is not in its fully pure form. In the waking state, when we perceive soul in association with the false things of the false world, the pure nature of self is not revealed to us. This is because many false adjectives are falsely attributed to the soul. In the state of deep sleep, when there is no object–knowledge or no knowledge of duality, then ajñana (ignorance) along with its mode (vṛtti) in the form of bliss is felt. So, it is a stage when through Vṛtti, self-revealing soul is directly known. Due to the revelation of the true nature of the soul to a certain extent in the state of deep sleep that one experiences bliss and for this reason, the state of dreamless sleep is known as *samprasād.* It is only in the stage beyond deep sleep (turīya) that the non-dual manifests itself in its truly real form.

Brahman as the Cause of the World

Brahman, in the opinion of Śaṁkara, is both the efficient and the material cause of the world. Being the substratum of the world, it is the efficient cause. The world can have no existence apart from it. It is also the material cause because the Śruti has stated "ekovijñānena sarva vijñānam ; yataḥ vā imāni bhūtāni jāyante etc". All Śruti texts have asserted that Brahman is the material cause of the world. It is only by knowing the cause that one can know its effects due to the prior existence of the effect in a latent form in the cause.

Here we may pose a question ; how can the formless, changeless Brahman becomes the material cause of the world? In the opinion of Śaṁkara, the world that makes its appearance being limited and determined by space, time and causality, has no metaphysical reality. Just as a magician, by

means of his magic power, creates a dream world, which is wholly different from the world of our everyday experience, in the same manner, due to the existence of a beginningless ignorance, this wonderful but false world has come into being. Magician appears as a possessor of magic power due to ignorance of the audience. Brahman too appears as the possessor of the creative force due to beginningless ignorance that exists in the individual soul in the form of narrow egoism made impure by anādi-vāsanā. The illusion producing principal (Māyā) covers the real form of Brahman and then by joining together self and not-self creates a fictitious ego-sense. This false ego-sense (ādhyāsika ātmā) enjoys through antaḥkaraṇa (internal organ) the false effect i. e., the false world of the false māyā. When Brahman, through reflection, vitalises māyā and makes it fit for becoming the changeable matrix of the world, lordly powers emerge in the sāttvika upādhi which are falsely ascribed to Brahman due to ignorance. Brahman thus seems to assume the role of Lord in respect of the universe. This saguṇa Brahman is the object of religious worship. He is the creator, preserver and destroyer of the world. Admission of such a creator-God in advaita philosophy is necessary, otherwise an inert and unconscious Māyā alone cannot be regarded as the matrix of a systematic world. The Upaniṣad has stated :

Sa aikṣata lokānnu sṛjā ti
Sa imān lokān asṛjat.

Such a statement shows clearly that the conception of Saguṇa Brahman is inseparably associated with the conception of the world. The world and the world-creator are related to each other.

The conception of Saguṇa Brahman is, thus, to be adhered to when Brahman is spoken of as both the efficient and the material cause of the world. Saguṇa Brahman or God is the giver of the fruits of actions. Since fruition of an action often takes place long after the performance of the deed, the

action itself cannot be the producer of its fruits. So, it is absolutely necessary to recognise the existence of *Saguṇa Brahman* as the ethical ruler of the universe. God creates this world in accordance with the accumulated merits and demerits of the individual souls. The real basis of this natural world is the ethical stuff existing in the form of Karma-vāsanās of the individual souls. Natural order appears *on* an ethical foundation.

Saguṇopāsanā (Worship of God) and its Result

From the above discussion, we get a clear idea that Nirguṇa Brahman is appearing as *saguṇa* so as to satisfy the religio-moral needs of the bound souls—needs which act as dynamic forces and inspire the bound-souls to look upward. But the soul that worships *Saguṇa Brahman* only goes to *Brahmaloka*. On reaching *Brahmaloka*, the individual soul becomes the possessor of lordly powers excepting the power of creation[1]. While in the *Brahmaloka*, the soul remains in the presence of God and enjoys divine pleasures under the supervision of God. The Śruti, too, has spoken of 'bhoga-sāmyatā' of the individual soul with God in Brahmaloka, [yasmādbhogamātrameśāmanādi-siddhe neśvareṇa samānamiti śruyate.]

Bhakit as a Means to Saguṇa-Prāpti

The Saguṇa-prāpti is possible by means of bhakti or devotion. To Śaṁkara also, devotion is akin to knowledge. He has stated clearly that a wise man, through devotion realises both the forms of *saccidānanda—the form of saguṇa* limited by *māyā* and also of the nirguṇa when devoid of all limiting conditions[2].

---

1. B. S. Śaṁkara's commentary 4-4-17.
2. Gītā. Śaṁkara's commentary 18-55.
   Bhaktyā mām abhijānāti yāvān aham upādhikṛta Vistarabhedo yaḥ ca aham vidhvasta sarvapādhibheda uttamā puruṣa ākāśa kalpaḥ tam mām advaitam····· anidhanam tattvataḥ abhijānāti·····

Liberation

The true form of liberation (paramamukti), however, is attained when the soul realises differencelessness (nirguṇatva). Pure self-knowledge leads to such realisation. The Śruti also says : "tarati śokamātmavit", "Brahmavidāpnotiparam" etc. The differenceless ātman is what is to be heard, reflected and meditated upon. This is immortality : this is liberation. The absolute consciousness or consciousness of differenceless ātman is, however, produced by a mode of the internal organ (antaḥkaraṇavṛtti)—a mode that assumes the form of Brahman and reveals it as free from all limiting conditions. This Brahmākārā vṛtti is the last knowledge of the self as the knower. This vṛtti arises when due to purification, the internal organ ceases to produce all other vṛttis which result in dualistic feelings of various sorts. The purified internal organ does not move or assume the form of any other wordly thing except the form of Brahman. After revealing Brahman as being devoid of all upādhis this Brahmākāra vrtti, too, dies a natural death, just as fire dies out after consuming the fuel. Knowledge that is due to the last modification (brahmākārāvṛtti) is alone capable of revealing Brahman in its pure limitless form. So the Śruti says : Ṛte jñānāt na muktiḥ.

Similarities between Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja in regard to Brahman.

If we compare Śaṁkara's conception of Brahman with that of Rāmānuja, we shall be able to detect close resemblances as well as differences between the views of these two great thinkers. Differences are of serious nature. Even then, these differences can be solved to a certain extent by bringing these two thinkers close to one another in many important matters. Both Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja have admitted Brahman as the only truth. The world and the individual soul have no existence apart from Brahman. Brahman is to be regarded as the ultimate support of all that we see, feel and touch. It is the substratum of all things which constitute the not-self. Brahman is unique and is

different from all things seen in this world. Both the thinkers, therefore, agree to hold that Brahman cannot be known through perception and inference. Scripture is the source through which Brahman can be realised.

Regarding efficient-material causality of Brahman, both the philosophers hold closely similar views. Brahman, they hold, is not the changeable material stuff of the world. It is the material cause of the world because it is the substratum of the changeable matrix. Both Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja have described Brahman as the true self of all. Bondage is destroyed when Brahman is realised.

God, in the opinion of both, is the ruler and supporter of the individual souls. It is due to Him that the natural and moral order of the universe have been brought together. It is God who creates the natural order in accordance with the accumulated merits and demerits of the individual souls.

Both Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja have described the path of devotion as the suitable path for the attainment of God. According to both, devotion is not divorced from knowledge. It is the knowledge of God that changes itself into divine love in devotion.

Differences

We may consider the points of difference between the views of these two outstanding personalities. The first thing that strikes us is that Śaṁkara has pinned his faith in Nirguṇa Brahman whereas for Rāmānuja Brahman is Saguṇa. Pure consciousness. devoid of qualities and differences is ātman or Brahman in the advaita philosophy of Śaṁkara ; but according to Rāmānuja, Brahman is the knower possessing knowledge as one of his qualities. This is because knowledge and being are not identical according to Rāmānuja. Like substance and its quality, knower and knowledge are also different. Knowledge for him can never exist without being related to an object. Self-revelation of knowledge implies that knowledge reveals itself as well as the object to its substrate, i.e. the soul or the knower. To say that knowledge

exists but does not manifest any object is to say something absurd and inconceivable. It is because the attributive knowledge possesses the power of manifesting an object that it is described as non-inert. This manifestation becomes meaningful only when the object is revealed to a subject. The distinction between knower and knowledge is never falsified in any level of experience. So, if knowledge is regarded as object-revealing, then the subject to whom the object is revealed, is to be regarded as the substratum of knowledge. This attributive knowledge is of the form of *maṇiprabhā*. Like rays, this attributive knowledge, too, streams out towards an object and reveals it. This ray-like attributive knowledge is changeable in nature as it gets related to objects.

That the knowledge in the stage of bondage is always an object-knowledge having a changeable and attributive nature, has been admitted by Śaṁkara, but in his opinion, the knower of this attributive knowledge is antaḥkaraṇāvacchinna jīva-caitanya.

All pervading consciousness, being limited by antaḥkaraṇa, appears as a wordly soul. The internal organ reaches the distant object through its mode and pramātri-caitanya which is changeable, reaches the external object through antaḥkaraṇa. Hence in Śaṁkara vedānta, it is the internal organ that mediates between jīvacaitanya and the object and brings them into knowledge-relation. So, there is no need for Śaṁkara to recognise the existence of a ray-like knowledge to brlng about the relation between the knower and the known. According to Rāmānuja, the individual soul which is the reai knower, is unchangeable. What is changeable is the internal organ. The internal organ alone possesses the capacity of reaching the object—a capacity that is not possessed by the immutable soul. So, to relate the soul to the object, the ray-like attributive knowledge has been introduced in the philosophy of Rāmānuja.

The ray-like attributive knowledge of Rāmānuja is not different from vṛttijñāna of Śaṁkar-vedanta so far as its relation to object is concerned. Both these forms of knowledge

are object-revealing and are of value in the empirical stage. We can, therefore, reasonably say that in the stage of bondage, Śaṁkara, too, has admitted the object-revealing character of knowledge like Rāmānuja The pramātā of Śaṁkara is the knower of this knowledge and this knowledge (vṛtijñāna) is a quality of pramātā—the substratum. Whether in the empirical stage, we call this object-revealing attributive knowledge *prabhā* or *vṛtti* does not make much difference if we were to understand it from the philosophical point of view.

In the stage of liberation, however, no object-revealing knowledge is apprehended according to Advaita-vedānta. Rāmānuja, on the contrary, holds that attributive knowledge exists in its pure form in the liberated soul also. If we think of the position of the attributive knowledge in the stage of liberation as expounded in the Qualified Monism, we find that although the ray-like knowledge exists in this stage, it is of no use from the practical point of view. This is because in the liberated stage, there is no other object of knowledge except God and since God is not an external or distant object, ray-like knowledge here does not perform the function that it generally performs in the bound state. Since the liberated soul does not know any natural object, it ceases to be a knower in the wordly sense. Even if we describe the liberated soul as knowledge, we do not make any mistake. It may, however, be said that although the ray-like knowledge has no obvious use in the liberated stage, knowledge is not objectless. God Himself becomes the object of knowledge of the liberated soul. It may be explained that ordinarily by object of knowledge we mean a natural object which is known through the internal organ. But in God-knowledge, the internal organ does uot function. Moreover *Īśvara-viṣayа* means *Īśvara-sambandha* and this relation to God exists also in the stage of bondage. Hence, when liberated, the soul does not know any new object.

It may be argued that Śaṁkara has not admitted the existence of two principles in the state of liberation and so the

question of subject-object relationship does not arise at all in his philosophy. But Rāmānuja has admitted the existence of two principles in the stage of liberation. Though Rāmānuja has admitted the existence of two principles, he has also admitted *paramā sāmya*, (highest affinity) between the two (one atomic and the other all-pervading). For this reason it is difficult for us to detect whether there is one or two. Both God and soul are principles of illumination. If a principle of illumination which is atomic in nature remains in close proximity to a principle of illumination which is all-pervading, then the separate existence of the atomic light cannot be distinguished at all. Both the philosophers have described Brahmaprāpti as *ānanda-prāpti*. The question that crops up in this connection is, do we realise in the final stage difference-less infinite bliss or do we realise God who is full of bliss ?

In the stage of bondage, Śaṁkara, too has felt the necessity of worshipping a loving God who is a creator, preserver and destroyer of the world. This creator-God is the indwelling soul of all things and beings and He possesses lordly powers and auspicious qualities. All actions of the Jīvas become effective only when these are approved of by God. With the help of His potential power, God has created this world for the enjoyment of the souls. He arouses devotion in the mind of a Jīva. He is the giver of the fruits of actions. In all these respects, Śaṁkara's conception of God does not differ from that of Rāmānuja.

The speciality of Śaṁkara lies in the fact that he has recognised a Nirguṇa stage beyond the *saguṇa* one. In his opinion liberation is attained only when there is "aikya" (oneness with this *nirguṇatattva*). To be one with-truth, the individual soul has to go beyond Brahmaloka which is not the last limit of the soul's spiritual journey.

In the opinion of Rāmānuja, too, the liberated soul goes beyond Brahmaloka to reach the abode of Viṣṇu ; but the final stage is a stage on the attainment of which the liberated

soul does not lose its existence and individuality; on the contrary, *Muktātmā* gains access to God who is its ultimate refuge.

If we reflect upon the real nature of the saguṇa-prāpti, we find that according to Rāmānuja also, the soul here gets rid of all natural imperfections, the removal of which calls for Divine help. The liberated soul possesses qualities like sarvajñatva, satyasaṃkalpatva etc. and is also capable of attaining everything by mere wish. So in this stage, the liberated soul is free from all natural qualities and is not in need of any substantial help from God. Divine kindness and compassion are no longer necessary to help the liberated soul in his onward journey. There is, therefore, no scope for the manifestation of the auspicious qualities of God in relation to a liberated soul. In such circumstances, recognition or non-recognition of qualities in the ultimate being is of not much value from the philosophical point of view. In the stage of bondage, of course, need for devotion to a qualified one has been recognised by Śaṃkara. So, when the soul is on the way to liberation, it clings to a qualified God; both the philosophers hold this view. The final stage is. however, a stage in which, although God of Rāmānuja is present, there is no scope for the manifestation of the beneficial qualities of God in regard to the liberated soul. From philosophical point of view, therefore it is very difficult for us to determine conclusively whether the final stage is a stage of oneness with nirgunatattva or a stage where the liberated soul attains similarity with saguṇa-tattva.

Both Śaṃkara and Rāmanuja have admitted that for the realisation of saguṇatattva, devotion is the most suitable path. Devotion, too, has been regarded by both as being of the nature of knowledge. While commenting on the Gītā 12.3 (where prayer to akṣara Brahman has been mentioned) Śaṃkara has stated :

Upāsanaṃ nāma yathā śāstram upāsyasya arthasya viṣayīkaraṇena sāmīpyam upagamya tailadhārāvat samānapratyayapravāhaṇa dīrghakālam yad āsanaṃ tad upāsanam ācākṣate.

For Rāmānuja also, Bhakti and upāsanā are synonymous terms and he has described devotion as

Tailadhārāvadavicchinna smṛti santānarūpā dhruvā smṛtiḥ 1
Śrībāṣya/1/1s

Rāmānuja, however, believes in the existence of a qualified being serving as the resting place of the liberated soul even in the stage of *paramukti*. Here one may ask ; what is it that is being realised by the liberated soul in the final stage ? If it is asserted that the soul realises the true form of God, then a further question may be asked : why this true form of God which is eternally present is not realised by the soul in the state of bondage ? If we say in reply that due to *Pratibhandhaka*, the true form of God is not realised, then we have to assume something like Śaṁkara's *avidyā*.

According to Rāmañuja, the soul in the final stage exists in its pure form being devoid of all natural conditions and God is also realised in its pure eternal form. These two *tattvas* exist in body-soul relation. The individual soul does not merge in God but becomes similar to God and remains in inseparable relation with him. According to some interpreters of Śaṁkara-vedanta[1], a liberated soul attains God-hood and remains in that state waiting for the liberation of all souls in bondage. When all souls will be liberated and all *upādhis* will be destroyed, then and then only difference between the soul and God will come to an end. To believe in jīva assuming the form of God or to assert that the atomic soul which has become similar to God remains in an inseparable union with him, does not make much difference. All these points provide much food for thought and I sincerely believe that open-mindedness and unbiased researches in these respects will enable the next generation to find a closer relation between Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja from philosophical point of view.

---

1. Siddhānta-lesha-saṁgraha—4/5/3/1
(Translation by Swami Gambhīrananda), p 259
Published by Udvodhana Karyalaya, Calcutta.

MEANING OF ADVAITA ACCORDING TO VIJNANA BHIKSU

Vijñāna Bhikṣu who belonged to the latter part of the sixteenth century A. D. wrote a commentary on the *Brahma-Sūtra* of Bādarāyaṇa. His object was to bring Brahma-Sūtra into a harmonious relation with all the orthodox systems of ancient Indian philosophy, because in his opinion, real antagonism exists between orthodox systems and heterodox systems only. One orthodox system is in no way radically opposed to another orthodox system.

Being a philosopher of a true synthetic outlook, he had also tried to prove that the roots of all orthodox systems could be traced to the Upaniṣads. So far as the Sāṅkhya philosophy was concerned, he primarily tried to prove that the said system was not atheistic. The Sāṅkhya philosophy, too, could be based on the *Brahma-Sūtra* and could be brought in line with the Advaita philosophy. In his opinion, the word *'advaita'* has not been used in its proper sense by Śaṅkara, as a result of which a false gulf has been created between the Sāṅkhya and the Vedānta philosophy. If the word *advaita* could be used in its right sense, then there would not have been any difficulty in comprehending fully the harmony between the Sāṅkhya-Yoga and the Vedānta philosophy.

According to Vijñāna Bhikṣu, the word *'advaita'* does not imply the absolute non-difference between the individual soul and Brahman ; nor does it assert the unreality of the *Jīvas*. He has used the word *'advaita'* to mean *avibhāga*, or non-separableness between Brahman and the individual soul. Like Rāmānuja, he has also admitted the reality of the three *tattvas*—Prakṛti Puruṣa, and God. Prakṛti is the unconscious dynamic principle and Puruṣa is the static principle of pure consciousness ; both of them are brought together by God

as a result of which the creative disturbance of the three *gunas* takes place in the bosom of Nature immediately (*asmābhistu prakṛtipuruṣasamyoga Iśvareṇa kriyte*, I.1.2.)

According to dualistic and atheistic Sāṅkhya, Prakṛti is independent and its dynamism is due to its own nature. According to Bhikṣu, however, cosmology is a cosmic history of Puruṣa and Prakṛti which are brought together for creative purposes by God. Puruṣa and Prakṛti are independent of each other, but they are to act jointly for the creation of a purposeful world. The joining together of spirit and matter is possible, only because both of them rest on a common substratum, i. e. God.

It is clear from the writings of Bhikṣu that he is not at all in favour of accepting a single differenceless Brahman as the sole reality ; nor is he in favour of admitting this world as a play of two wholly independent principles, like spirit and matter of any dualistic system. In his opinion, an unconscious principle cannot, of its own accord, enter into an effective and creative relation with Pure Consciousness. This must be done by a spiritual being higher than both Puruṣa and Prakṛti. The greatness of God and the littleness of both man and the world do not suggest a theory of absolute non-dualism; on the other hand, the very conception of God a sthe substratum of both man and the world prevents us from imagining a separable relationship between God and either of the two *tattvas*, i. e., spirit and matter. The creative process in Nature begins at the will of God. Prakṛti has no independent teleological power by dint of which it can move and change of its own accord. Both Prakṛti and Puruṣa are energies of God and, as such, they have no existence apart from Him. Prakṛti is the changeable stuff of the universe. Puruṣa is the ground of all sorts of world-experience (*bhogāśraya*), and God is the ultimate substratum of both Puruṣa and Prakṛti. Both Puruṣa and Prakṛti remain indistinguishably merged in God prior to creation, and this indistinguishable

union of the three *tattvas* is what has been described as '*advaita*' in the Upaniṣads. God, according to Bhikṣu, is the substratum (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of Puruṣa and Prakṛti, the material and the efficient cause of the world, the *sākṣin* of all and is also the *aṁśin* of which the individual self is the *aṁśa*. In each of these aspects, the relation of '*avibhāga*' holds true between God and the other two *tattvas*, and this sense of *avibhāga* is the proper sense in which the Advaita Śruti texts should be understood.

God as the Adhiṣṭhāna-Kāraṇa

According to Bhikṣu, *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa* (substratum) is that which, by remaining inseparably related (*avibhaktam*) to the real and changeable material cause, prompts the latter to create the cosmic order.[1] The *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa* is also that in which all things remain in a non-manifested, subtle condition (*yasmin layaṁ yāti*) at the time of dissolution. Both these characteristics belong to God only and not to any other being. Further, He is also the ultimate Being into which the individual souls enter in the state of final realization. The goal is '*sāyujya*' and not '*aikya*' with Brahman. In whatever way God is looked at, there is always this relation of inseparability (*avibhāga*) between Him and Puruṣa and Prakṛti.

Although God is the *adhisthāna-kāraṇa*, and in this sense, is also called the original cause, still His causality is not to be understood in the ordinary sense of the causality of a modifiable principle.

God is the unmodifiable principle of pure consciousness which vitalizes Prakṛti by His presence as the only witnessing self of the pre-evolutionary stage. Prakṛti, in its essence is pure potentiality which can evolve into definite categories of the world only through its relation with the Puruṣa. This association between Puruṣa and Prakṛti or pure potentiality and consciousness is possible due to the presence of Divine

1. *Vijñānāmṛta-bhāṣya*. I. 1. 2. Chowkhamba Publications, p. 32.

Consciousness which shines in its full glory through the three stages of creation, preservation, and dissolution of the world. The conception of God as the vitalizing principle of the modifiable stuff of the world is also present in the philosophy of Śaṅkara. God in the Śaṅkara-Vedānta is Brahman reflected in Māyā and it is due to the reflection of consciousness in Māyā that the blind *upādhi* of God changes at once into an active potentiality of a meaningful creation. Brahman dissociated from Māyā is simply the differenceless and static consciousness. God of Bhikṣu is pure consciousness associated with *śuddha-sattva* which is His *nitya-upādhi*. God is able to think or will through the instrument of *śuddha-sattva* alone. In His true nature, God is only pure consciousness devoid of all forms of agency.

Like Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja, Bhikṣu, too, has ascribed the power of vitalizing the material stuff of the world to God, but while Rāmānuja has admitted this power as an *aiśvarya* of the highest Being, and Śaṅkara has described it as phenomenal and false from the transcendental point of view, Bhikṣu has sought an intermediate position between the two. In essence, his God is devoid of all qualities and power which actually belong to His *upādhi* ; but since His *upādhi* is eternal, all qualities and powers are always ascribable to Him.

God as the Material and the Efficient Cause.

Since God is the substratum of the modifiable stuff of the world, God is also called the material cause (*upādāna kāraṇa*) of the word. The word *'upādāna'* has, however, been used here in a sense which is entirely different from the sense in which modifiable Prakṛti is the *upādāna* of the world. Since the foundational principle cannot be separated from that of which it is the foundation, God cannot be separated from the world. The real modifiable stuff of the world is Prakṛti, but God as the substratum of both Prakṛti and the world has been described as the *upādāna-kāraṇa* of the world (*vikārikāraṇavād-*

adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇasyāpyupādanatvavyavahārāt). Where non-separableness between the cause and the effect is due to the relation of inherence, there the cause is a changeable one ; but the cause is simply the unmodifiable substratum of the effect where, though non-separable from the effect, it is still not related to it by the relation of inherences. *Ākāśa* is the *upādāna-kāraṇa* of the air only in the sense of its unmodifiable and inseparable substratum. The real modifiable cause of the air is *sparśatanmātra*. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophers have described this type of causality as the efficient causality of God. According to Bhikṣu, however, the *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇātva* of God is different from *nimitta-kāraṇatva* since, in the latter case, the efficient cause can be separated from the effect. The foundational principle, on the other hand, can never be separated from the effect that is grounded on it. So Bhikṣu has mentioned four forms of causes : (1) *samavāyī*, (2) *asamavāyī*, (3) *nimitta-kāraṇa* and (4) *adhiṣṭhānakāraṇa*.

When God is spoken of as the efficient cause of the world, then also, the efficient causality of God refers simply to His witnessing character (*sūryavat sākṣitāmātreṇa jñānadvāraiva nimitta-kāraṇam Brahma*). The *sūtra* '*Janmādyasya yataḥ*'. refers to God as the unmodifiable and inseparable substratum, and it is only in this sense that the epithet of material causality has been ascribed to Him. In Himself, God is only pure, static eonsciousness, but since He is never separated from its *upādhi* in the form of *śuddha-sattva*, the agency, activity, etc. which belong to the *upādhi* are also attributed to God. Here, God is not the unmodifiable ground of falsehood or appearance as has been admitted by Śaṃkara. On the contrary, He is the unmodified substratum of a real world that has been evolved from a real chargeable cause in the form of Prakṛti. At the time of dissolution, Prakṛti ceases to have any activity and it also becomes subtle and indistinguishable from God. This is the meaning of *prakṛtilaya* : Prakṛti, the real cause of a real world, is never destroyed. Puruṣa, too, in this state, withdraws all its epistemological activities and this

inoperative state of Puruṣa is what is meant by the mergence of Puruṣa in God. These facts show that during the state of dissolution, God remains inseparable and indistinguishable from Puruṣa and Prakṛti. This indistinguishable union of the three *tattvas* is what is described in the Śruti as '*advaita*'.

Again, when one soul is liberated, other souls remain in a bound condition. So, Prakṛti remains in existence and continues to work for the benefit of the bound souls. The activities of Prakṛti come to an end in respect of the released soul only. That particular Prakṛti which is meant solely for the enjoyment of the soul that has been released becomes very subtle and gets merged in its substratum (i. e. God). The released soul also enters into God and remains indistinguishable from Him. Hence in the state of release too there is *advaita* or the relation of *avibhāga* between the three *tattvas*.

God as the Witnessing Consciousness

According to Bhikṣu, God is to be regarded as the prime witnessing consciousness, since prior to creation, there remains no other principle which can possess the attribute of *sākṣitva*. Unless this *sākṣṭtva* is attributed to God who is the sole principle of revelation in the pre-evolutionary stage, creation of the world cannot be explained.

God as Aṃśin and the Individual soul as the Aṁśa of Him

Since God is the primary principle of consciousness, He has been described by Bhikṣu as the *aṁśin* from whom the individual souls are derived as so many sparks from a single fire. Like sparks, they too resemble God in so far as they are of the nature of consciousness. Although the souls have separate being, still they have no separate and independent existence of their own. Both Puruṣa and Prakṛti exist in God who brings them together at the time of creation. God, as the supreme principle, shoulders the sole responsibility for the creation, maintenance, and destruction

of the world. *Aṁśatva* implies truly the *sajātīyatva* of God and also the inseparableness of the individual soul from God. The words '*sampat*', '*laya*', etc., too, mean nothing but non-separableness (*avibhāga*). The objection that partless Brahman cannot have parts is not sound, since in actual life, the son is always regarded as a part of the father. There is also *avibhāga* between the father and the son in the sense that the son will always remain related to his father by the relation of sonship throughout the whole period of his existence. The two together will constitute a single family unit, in spite of their having separate beings of their own. [1] It is because the individual is a part of God only in the sense in which the son is a part of the father that their is no difficulty in admitting the soul, too, as *vibhu*. When the infinite soul manifests itself through its *upādhi*, it appears as finite and limited.

From the above discussions, it can be reasonably held that according to Bhikṣu, the word '*advaita*' has been used in the Śruti texts with a view to proclaiming clearly that both Puruṣa and Prakṛti rest solely and wholly on Brahman which is their *adhiṣṭhāna* or the ground-principle. In the absence of this *sadādhiṣṭhāna*, the co-operation of two principles having separate *sattā* and separate *sthiti* cannot be logically explained.

Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja have aiso admitted Brahman as the *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa*, but the sense in which Bhikṣu has spoken of Brahman as the *adhiṣṭhāna* is different from that of Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja. According to Śaṅkara, Brahman is only the *adhiṣṭhāna* of illusion. It is not the substratum of any metaphysically real power. In Rāmānuja, on the other hand, we find that Brahman is the *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa* of *cit* and *acit* both of which are regulated, controlled, and guided by this highest Reality. Just as the car driver is the

1. *Vijñānāmṛta-bhāṣya* ; Published by Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Part I Page 52

ruler of the car, in the same manner Brahman is the ruler of both *cit* and *acit*. In the opinion of Bhikṣu however, it is only as the primary foundational principle of revelation that Brahman is regarded as the sole substratum of all things and beings of the world. All powers and glories really belong to *śuddha-sattva* which is the *nitya upādhi* of the ultimate Reality.

In fact, Bhikṣu has not made any distinction, like Śaṅkara, between Saguṇa Brahman and Nirguṇa Brahman, as belonging to two different levels of existence and reality. In his opinion, although Brahman, in essence, is pure and *nirguṇa* yet being eternally associated with the adjunct in the form of *śuddhasattva* in which *viśvākārā-vṛtti* is eternally present, the highest Being assumes for all time the role of a revealer and manifests the *sāttvika-vṛtti* of the world-form by His own light. Thus according to Bhikṣu Brahman and Īśvara do not belong to two different levels of reality. The representation of Brahman as God is not a concession to the weakness of the ignorant mind. Both are equally real. When Brahman is thought of apart from the *upādhi*, the highest Reality is *nirguṇa* and when it is thought of along with its *upādhi* which comprises powers and glories, Brahman is legitimately described as the omnipotent God. Brahman, in the philosophy of Rāmanuja, however, is always a qualified one and is the ruler and supervisor of the whole universe.

Further, the word *avibhāga* used by Bhikṣu to mean *advaita* has a connotation slightly different from the connotation of the expression '*apṛthaksiddhi*' used by Rāmānuja in his philosophy of Viśiṣṭadvaita. Of course, the word *apṛthaksiddhi* or inseparableness has been used by Rāmānuja in his philosophy with a view to explaining the organic unity of the three *tattvas*—*cit*, *acit* and Īśvara ; but this inseparableness (existing between *cit*, *acit*, and Īśvara) is, in his opinion, identical with the inseparable relation existing between the body and the soul of a living being. Here, if

one wishes, one can perceive soul and body as different, although from the practical point of view, the soul and the body are generally treated as one. The oneness or unity established between *cit*, *acit*, and Īśvara by the body-soul relation exists in the same manner in both the unmanifested and manifested conditions of the world. Even in the state of release, this unity continues to hold good from the standpoint of the Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy. According to Bhikṣu, however, the unity created by *avibhāga* exists only in the unmanifested condition, when Brahman alone is felt and the other two *tattvas* (Puruṣa and Prakṛti), being devoid of their activities, remain merged in the supreme Reality. In the manifested condition, the relation between Brahman and the two other *tattvas* is not like the relation of an indistinguishable union created by throwing the water of a jar in a pond ; on the other hand, the relation of *avibhāga* then resembles the relation of inseparableness existing between the father and his son as both of them constitute one family unit.

Here, it can be pointed out very cogently that non-difference or oneness existing between the father and the son is less prominent than the non-difference which is admitted to exist between the body and the soul from the practical point of view. The father and the son possess different bodies and their experiences of pleasures and pains are also different. So, from this point of view, Bhikṣu's explanation of *advaita* in the manifested condition of the world is not very satisfying.

In fact, Bhikṣu has introduced God in his philosophy simply as a static principle of revelation. He is not the real creator, preserver, and destroyer of the world. All activities, all thoughts, and all feelings belong to His *prakṛtimūlaka-upādhi* only. Hence, although Prakṛti has been assigned a sub-ordinate status, still because of the essentially inactive nature of Bhikṣu's Brahman, the independence of Prakṛti has been maintained to a very great extent in his philosophy. God is only the *sākṣin*, a mere revealing principle. The

vitalization of pure potentiality by consciousness is necessary even in the pre-evolutionary stage and so God has been introduced in the philosophy of Bhikṣu primarily with a view to satisfying this very essential need. In his opinion, it is not proper to describe the philosophy of Sāṅkhya in an atheistic manner, because in the pre-evolutionary stage, it is the consciousness of God alone that can account for the intelligization of the unconscious potentiality of Prakṛti for the creation of this world, which is the moral stage for the spiritual development of so many individual souls.

MEANING OF IMMORTALITY IN UPANISADS AND VEDANTA

The word "immortality" generally refers to the eternity of the soul which does not come to an end when the body dies. The body belongs to this mortal world but not the soul. So even when a body dies, the soul that resides in it, continues its existence either here or elsewhere where joy and misery result according to its own deserts. Immortality, thus, follows as a necessary consequence of the Upaniṣadic premise : the soul is eternal.

Not a Dogmatic Concept

The eternality of the soul is also not a dogmatic assumption of the ancient Indian philosophy. The soul, according to traditional Hindu philosophy, refers to the principle of consciousness in living beings and this consciousness seems to be fundamental in the sense that with its help alone everything in the universe becomes known to us. Even the sun and the moon which scatter light to reveal objects, cannot be known or cognised without consciousness.

This principle of consciousness has not been identified with intellect owing to the fact that intellectual modifications undergo changes and these changes presuppose some unchangeable principle as the basis ; otherwise, different mental states happening in different points of time, cannot be united in the total experience of a single person.

Consequently, memory, recognition etc. which are concerned with facts happening at different times, cannot be satisfactorily explained. The underlying and uniting principle is the soul or pure consciousness which reveals all changing modifications of the intellect and makes them appear as objects.

So "intellect" falls on the side of the object and not on the side of the subject or consciousness. The revelation of intellectual modifications as objects is a fact of experience, and therefore, these modifications which need a revealing principle other than themselves, cannot be regarded as fundamental or ultimate.

So, pure consciousness is ultimate and not the intellect. This pure consciousness is self-revealing and it never becomes an object of cognition like the various modifications of the intellect. Since the soul or the principle of pure consciousness is the knower of all sorts of wordly experiences, it is unchangeable: because one who is in change, cannot perceive change.

In order to appreciate the two different states—say new and old—of one and the same object, the Individual must continue to exist at different periods of time and must have a belief in his personal identity. The soul is, therefore, unchangeable and permanent.

Now, this unchageability of the soul leads to the assumption of its eternality. If a thing is unchangeable, that means it is trans-temporal or eternal, This eternal nature of the soul is its essential character, although in its worldly life, this character is hidden from us owing to beginningless ignorance. To gain back this eternality of one's own soul is to *to become Immortal.* All other things of the world are changeable and mortal. It is only the soul which is ultimate, unchangeable and therefore both eternal and immortal.

Self realisation

Immortality is, thus, synonymous with self-realisation, emancipation or liberation. It is because *amritatva* refers to self-realisation which can be had only through wisdom and meditation as explained by *Yajnavalkya* in reply to *Maitrey's* question that there is never any prospect of Immortality through wealth or worldly materials. (*amritatvasya tu nashasti vitteneti*),

Worldly gains and worldly enjoyments are of use to us only in this empirical life. They cannot lead us to self-realisation or Immortality. It is only by studying scriptures and by following the instructions of the scriptures in the worldly life that a man can remove all sorts of impurities from his mind and with a mind thus purified, he is able to have a direct experience of Immortality which is the supreme goal of his life. Immortal life is, thus, the free and true life of the spirit which the spirit gains back when the artificial connection with the worldly life or its false sense of identity with mind and body is completely destroyed.

Two forms of Immortality

Such Immortality, however, may be either personal or impersonal. Both the forms have been described in the Upaniṣads as a result of which Vedānta opinion has developed in two different manners. The believers in personal immortality hold that when the soul regains its true form, it is lifted to the region of God and lives in His constant companionship.

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, for example, it has been stated that an immortal individual is lifted to the region of God whom he has worshipped with devotion, love and respect : in the abode of God, the liberared soul experiences all sorts of pleasures which exist in that region. Again, the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad says that one enjoys immortality, when by becoming pure, one lives in the pleasant companionship of God who is the Highest Reality. All these passages advocate personal immortality.

According to the theory of personal immortality, a liberated soul on attaining an immortal life, loses its natural body and appears in its own divine form and divine character. In this stage, the soul becomes completely free from influences of all his virtues and vices and becomes similar to God in respect of its nature as Pure Consciousness. (Muṇḍaka 3-1-3.)

Liberation, however, does not mean emergence of any new quality. The soul being free from the defects of ignorance, gains back its natural luminosity and shines forth in its own

immortal glory. This type of personal immortality has been advocated by Rāmānuja and his followers who believe in the essential difference between the individual soul and God.

Impersonal Immortality

There are other passages in the Upaniṣads which may very well be interpreted in favour of an impersonal immortality. In the Bṛhad Upaniṣad, for example, it has been stated that the rivers when flowing into the sea, lose their different names and forms and become one with the sea. In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, it has been stated that a liberated soul becomes mingled after death with the whole universe. All these passages have been interpreted by Śaṁkara to mean "absorption in Brahman".

Śaṁkara believes that the individual self is in reality identical with Brahman. It is ignorance that hides this truth from a man's view and makes him appear as a limited person. When through long and devoted study of the Vedānta, the individual directly realises the truth that the soul is identical with Brahman, it ceases to have an independent personality of its own. The individual soul then becomes the Truth or merges in the Truth. One who knows Brahman, becomes Brahman which is *sat, cit and ānanda.*

Immortality—A Bliss

This immortal state has also been described in the Vedānta as a state of infinite bliss. According to Śaṁkara, Brahman is existence, consciousness and bliss. Since the soul is identical with Brahman, it is also unlimited consciousness and bliss. Therefore, when the soul gains back its true nature and is merged in Brahman, it becomes *amrita, ānanda* or bliss.

Thus, if the word *amrita* is understood to mean the highest form of happiness, then also it has reference to the soul and the highest reality. The thing that gives us highest pleasure is the soul, because we find that a wordly-object becomes dear to a person only when it is related to his soul. Wealth,

not owned by me does not give me any pleasure. The huge bank balance of a stranger is no cause for joy to me. I shall, however, feel pleased if the cash is deposited in my name.

Similarly, the son of an unknown person is not a pleasure to me. It is my own son who can give me most pleasure. This is why *Yajnavalkya* has said : "Verily the husband is dear to the wife not for the sake of the husband, my dear, but it is for her own sake that he is dear. Verily, the wife is dear to the husband not for the sake of the wife, my dear, but it is for his own sake that she is dear".

Now, since a thing becomes pleasant and desirable by getting related to the soul the soul must be of infinite bliss. Otherwise, it would not have been possible for the soul to make pleasant anything that gets related to it. Therefore, even if by *amrita* we mean bliss or happiness then also the word applies to the soul.

From this sense of *amrita*, too, the indestructibility and eternality of the soul can be derived. A thing that is destructible cannot be an object of infinite pleasure because of its destructible nature. The highest form of love can only have for its object an eternal entity which can serve as the never-ending source of pleasure. The object of the highest love cannot be material for a material object is dependent on consciousness for its manifestation and as such is inferior to consciousness.

That which is of an inferior nature cannot give us the highest form of pleasure when the superior one is also present. The soul being of the nature of consciousness, is therefore *amrita* or the object of the highest form of love. It is also independent and as such is self-revealing. It does not depend on anything else for its existence or revelation.

State of Liberation

In fact, Śaṁkara has admitted that the state of liberation is not only a state of non-duality but it is also a state of blissful existence. According to Rāmānuja, however, the state of liberation is a state of dual existence, if considered

ontologically. But psychologically, due to the presence of love, the individual soul feels as if it has become one with God. This consciousness of union and constant companionship with him is the source of infinite bliss to the liberated soul.

God is immeasurable *amrita* and the soul is also *amrita.*

Hence the state of liberation which is a state of communion between God and the individual soul is also a state of infinite bliss and happiness. The individual soul is completely immersed in the enjoyment of the bliss or *amrita* of God which is the Truest and the Highest self. In facts, Divine Love is nothing but the immortal bliss of emancipation and spiritual freedom.

When we reflect carefully on the idea of Immortality, we come to realise that on the evidence of the gradual expansion of the soul in different stages of our worldly-life, we can reasonably believe in its eternal existence extending beyond the barriers of space and time.

Expansion of Self

A child, for example, has a vague consciousness of self. The self of the child remains confined to the body only and cannot even be identified with other members of the family. In this state, the self remains confined to the present time only and cannot stretch itself to cover the future. The child is conscious of the present needs and never tries to make provision for the future. When the child grows into a boy, the soul becomes more expanded. The boy can identify himself with his brothers, sisters, school friends etc ; although he is incapable of thinking of remote future, he can do so with regard to near future. Thus the soul is spreading itself beyond the narrow temporal and spatial limitations of childhood.

Again, an adult person is capable of thinking not only of his own life, but also of the life of his children who are parts and parcels of his own self and through whose life, his life is to be continued in an unbroken chain. Here, the

self-knowledge of the adult is fuller and richer than the self-knowledge of a small boy or of a little child. Thus, in our worldly life, we find that expansion of self takes place simultaneously with the advancement in knowledge.

In view of what is stated above, there is justification for our belief in an eternal and immortal soul voiced by the Upaniṣads and the Vedānta. When the knowledge of an individual is purified and perfected, he is capable of realising the eternality and the immortality of the soul in a clear manner. The soul in that state is truly felt to be beyond all spatial and temporal limitations. This is the final truth which an unwise man can neither find nor conceive of.

Immortality of Soul

Amid diverse mysteries of the world, immortality of the soul is one which can be solved through wisdom only and not through imperfect intellectual knowledge. The very fact that a child cannot realise fully the extension of his self beyond the present, does not keep its self confined to the present time only : in the same manner, the imperfect understanding of an ordinary person does not really offer enough ground for refuting the eternality and immortality of the soul which have been fully and clearly comprehended by the saints and prophets of different ages.

The lust for life is not the source of our belief in immortality. It is the recognition of consciousness as the universal and the fundamental principle that logically leads us to accept the theory of an immortal self. This Eternal and Infinite Consciousness is the One Absolute Certainty upon which rests the whole of this world.

Again, if we push our enquiry far back and try to find out the cause for this lust for life, then also we find that the cause is nothing but this blissful nature of the soul. In the living state, the soul remains associated with the sense-organs as a result of which a person enjoys the happiness of the

ātma-bhāva : at death, however, the connection of the self with the sense-organs comes to an end and *ātmānanda* (happiness of the soul) too vanishes at once. It is this desire for the persistent enjoyment of the happiness of *ātman* that really lies at the root of our lust for life. From all that we have said above, it is easy to conclude that the soul is of the nature of *amrita* by gaining which man realises his perfection, divinity and blissful existence.

MEANING OF YOGA IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF BHAGAVAD GITA

The word Yoga in the Gītā does not seem to stand for the "Astānga Yoga" of *Patanjali* where it has been used in the special sense of cessation of mental states. This technical sense of the word does not seem to have been adopted by the author of the Gītā in the exposition of his own doctrine and ideal. The distinction in meaning of the word "Yoga" in the Gītā and the Yoga Sūtra is so clear and definite that not a single interpreter of the Bhagavad Gītā has ever adhered to the technical sense of *Patanjali*.

In the Bhagvad Gītā the word Yoga has been used in different senses in different contexts. When used with sāṁkhya and Bhakti, the word seems to mean association or union. Sāṁkhya in the Gītā means pursuit of true knowledge or wisdom. It has been stated that the Sāṁkhyas (wisemen) attain liberation by following the path of unwavering and steady devotion. Both Śankara and Śridharasvāmī have taken the word "Sāmkhyānam" in the sense of wise people. These wise people are born, as it were, with a thorough and clear knowledge of *ātman* and their earnest devotion to knowledge helps them to renounce worldly pleasures for the sake of the highest truth. Such is also the goal reached by the devoted persons or "*Bhakti-Jukta Puruṣas*".

Association with Karma

The word Yoga has also been used in association with Karma. For example, *Karma yogena Yoginām, Karma-yogamaśakta, Sannyāsā Karma Yogaśca Karmayogena Cāpare etc.* Here the word does not seem to have been used in the former sense of union in any one of these contexts. In "*Karmayogena Yoginām*", the suggestion apparently is not that man can attain liberation by performing actions or by becoming *Karma-Yukta* : because in that case all persons

should be able to achieve liberation and then there would have been no need of a special doctrine of Karma Yoga, as expounded by Śrikrishna. "*Karmayogamaśakta*" refers to one who is incapable of practising Karma-Yoga. In "*Sannyāsa Karmayogaśca*" *Karma-Yoga* seems to refer to a special method of performing actions for attaining the highest goal. In "*Karmayogena Cāpare*" too, Yoga seems to have a similar reference. The meaning of Yoga used in all these contexts will become clear to us if we take into consideration the meaning of the sentence "*Yogah Karmaṣu kauśalam*" i.e. Yoga means some special skill for performing actions in worldly life : this speciality consisting in—renunciation of the fruits of action. This skill is needed for the attainment of the stability or balance of mind without which a man will not be able to free himself from the shackles of Karma and bondage. Ordinary people of the world are passionate, ambitious, easily affected by joys and sorrows, gains or loss. They generally perform actions, driven by desire and attachment. The desires and attachment disturb the equality of mind and so desire-prompted actions strengthen the bond of man and prevents him from attaining liberation.

Gītā & Karma Yoga

Every action in ordinary course springs from desire and results in impressions which become the seeds of future activities and desires. In other words, we can say that every action is followed by corresponding reaction and this law of action and reaction is called the law of Karma or the law of cause and effect. So long as a man remains bound to this law of Karma he performs various activities and thus goes on weaving his own cobweb of birth and death. So the question naturally arises : Is there no way out of this whirlpool of birth, death and new birth ? The followers of the path of renunciation suggest that giving up of all actions is the only means for destroying the bonds of Karma. Since one Karma leads to another and thereby sows the seeds of a new life, it is best to become completely inactive. But giving up

of all actions on a mass scale is not at all advisable and practicable from the worldly point of view. Social life and social stability will be at stake if everybody refrains from doing action. Absolute inactivity means death. For preserving body and mind, activity is needed. Again for propagation of species, activity is needed: In fact, life sustains on activity. So the author of the Gītā refrains from speaking in favour of complete inactivity. On the other hand, he opens a new avenue, brings new messages of hope and light for human being by expounding his theory of Yoga in Karma. It is not the external as such that really binds a man to worldly life, it is the desire—the mental stage of human action—that pollutes his spiritual being and dislocates him from his real status. Attachment, anger and greed are the three gates of hell that veil wisdom as smoke covers fire. Karma-Yoga, therefore, with its emphasis on the disinterested performance of worldly duties provides human beings with a new path of emancipation and freedom. No human being can live without performing some kind of action and the Gītā seeks to show how, by means of Karma Yoga, this constant output of energy may be utilised by human beings to attain to perfection and release from transmigration. The special art of performing one's duties is the art of keeping oneself absolutely disinterested in and non-attached to worldly pleasures and pains. When the mind runs in madness after the objects of senses, the intellectual background is disturbed and so the mind fails to proceed in its course, fixed for the attainment of knowledge and freedom. By controlling senses, however, one can secure the equability of mind which is needed for achieving wisdom and perfection. Attachment to worldly objects are formed by continued association with sense-objects and attachment leads to desire. The person who indulges in sense gratifications moves in the cycle of birth and death. Giving up of attachment and controlling the senses, therefore, constitute the indispensable pre-condition for communion with God and the fulfilment of

this pre-condition in action is Karma-Yoga. Mere physical inactivity without a corresponding control of senses and cessation from nursing passions and desires in mind, is a bad and vicious path. The author of the Gītā has repeatedly remarked that the proper way of doing actions is to dissociate one's mind from desires and attachment. The effects of any action can bind the doer only when in doing that action he has a selfish motive to realise. But if he does not seek anything for himself and performs the action disinterestedly, his work will not affect him in any way. A man should therefore, give up all his desires for selfish motives and dedicate all his actions to God and still go on performing all the ordinary duties of life. This is Yoga in action as expounded in the philosophy of the Bhagavad Gītā. To be unselfish, non-attached and disinterested in worldly gains and losses is the supreme duty of human beings. Disinterested performance of action will produce a change in the personality and outlook of man. *Detachment from self and attachment to God is what the word Yoga actually refers to in the Bhagavad Gītā.* Desire as such is not always bad. It is the nature of the object that determines the moral quality of desire. If the object is self's own pleasure and enjoyment, the desire is to be discarded ; if God, then the man has the purest desire that will bring about his union with the Supreme Reality. Such a person perceives God in all things and all things in God. Men and animals, low and high are the same in his eyes. Caste and creed lose all meaning and significance for him. He has then a broader and a higher vision of man and the universe. The universe for him is a vast sea of Divinity and there is no distinction between man and man. Through his deeper vision, he preceives the Divine Spark in his own self as well as in all other beings and things of the universe. Having realised oneness, he becomes united with God and this union with God is the real Yoga brought about by the performance of the normal duties of life in a purely disinterested and non-attached manner.

CONCLUSION

In fine, it can be stated that by using the word "Yoga" in a special sense, the Gītā has sought to bring about a harmony between the ordinary life of duties and responsibilities and the supra-ordinary life of divinity and freedom. To feel oneness with the life divine, to practise complete self-surrender to God and consequently to dissociate oneself from ego-centric desires, constitute the full connotation of the word *Yoga*. Dissociation from ego-centric desires is achieved by the performances of disinterested actions. When the shell of one's individuality is thus broken, he realises his identity with the Great Soul and this is the stage of God-Consciousness or Divine Love. This realisation of oneness of spirit is the highest ideal of life and the Gītā seeks to show that this ideal or supra-ordinary state can be achieved by a person even in his normal worldly life by the practice of Yoga (attachment to God and detachment from self.)

HISTORY OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY : ITS RE-ORIENTATIONS

The need for re-orienting the history of Indian philosophy is greater today because this will enable us to get a comprehensive idea about the culture and heritage of one's country. It is, of course, not possible to study accurately the history of Indian Philosophy of the ancient period because of certain difficulties. In the first place, a thorough chronological recording of thoughts and materials is not possible, because the Indians of that age cared more for the truth realised : obviously, they did not attach any importance to the life and date of the author. In fact, they were more interested in enjoying the fruits and flowers of the tree of religion rather than trying to find out the planter.

The position is, however, quite different if we refer to Western philosophy. While it is easy to give a detailed chronological account of the thought development of a particular philosopher of the Western world, with special reference to his age, date and the extent of indebtedness to the preceding thinkers, it is not so in the field of ancient Indian philosophy. The dates which have so far been collected through the strenuous efforts of many oriental scholars, are uncertain and the periods in which the history of ancient Indian philosophy is generally divided are arbitrary and artificial.

Our Heritage

Happily today, we have become more particular about our own faith and philosophy, culture and civilisation. Today we realise more than anybody else the need for having a command over our own heritage. A mere chronological treatment of philosophical thought is not enough to realise the cultural heritage of a country. A true realisation of Indian culture presupposes an accurate analytico-synthetic

knowledge of all important changes and developments, occurring in the different spheres of Indian life in different ages. In this respect, I find that all standard works on the history of Western philosophy lay stress on the chronological development of philosophical thought, thereby ignoring the socio-political background of that particular age. It is, therefore, felt that the traditional method of writing a history of philosophy needs a change. What is really needed is a new outlook. There should be a new method of approach by which it should be possible to trace, in the first place, the historical development of philosophical thought in the background of major social, political and economic changes.

On the soil of India, prophets and philosophers had appeared from time to time who had given a new method of thinking in the field of philosophy. Their messages were really the cumulative effect of the various factors relating to different aspects of life of that age. For example, we may very well refer to the philosophical teachings of personalities like Lord Buddha and Śaṁkara in the context of social, political and religious conditions of their respective periods.

Philosophy of Buddha

Although Buddhism was regarded as anti-Brāhmanic and anti-Vedic in form and character, closer study reveals otherwise, because it resembles the teachings of the Upaniṣads. In fact, while studying Buddhism, one gains the impression as if he is studying something fully in accordance with the traditional faith, philosophy and religion. I should like to cite examples to show parallelism between Buddhism and the traditional Vedic thoughts.

The sages of the Upaniṣads realised by their insight and wisdom the utter worthlessness of this transitory world. They declared emphatically that nothing stands, nothing remains fixed and nothing endures for ever. Not only this : they were also eager to find out that which would make them deathless,

would place them in the *amrita-loka* or the region of immortality.

In the philosophy of Lord Buddha, we find that the interpretations of the worldly life given by him and the ultimate object sought by him were not different from those of the Upaniṣads. Lord Buddha has said : "Oh Bhikkus, listen, I I have found *Amritam* which will bring to man an assurance of immortality."

In the four noble truths which Lord Buddha has preached, he has taught that the world is transitory and is, therefore, painful. He has further said that there are noble steps which one can follow to remove desire which is the cause of worldly existence. So far as this cause of worldly existence is concerned, there also we find parallel truths in Buddhism and Vedic philosophy. It has been stated in the Rigveda : In the beginning there was *Kāma*, the earliest seed of mind and the wise sages in their hearts found out the bond of *Sat* in *Asat*. In brief, we can say that according to this *Sūkta*, desire is the only snare that binds the world—there is no other bond. In Buddhism, *Māra* is depicted as the evil one who is the root cause of all sorts of sufferings and this *Māra* is nothing but *Kāma* or desire personified. The literature of the Vedic philosophy is full of this idea of *Kāma* and its annihilation, and in this respect Buddhism is, indeed, an offshoot of the great tree of Vedic religion.

All these similarities and many others have been brought to light by several oriental scholars of the 19th and 20th centuries who took pains to show how Buddhism in essence was not different from the Upaniṣadic thoughts and ideas which constituted the "central force" of the Vedic religion.

Anti-Vedic Feature

The most remarkable anti-Vedic feature of Buddhism figured prominently in the form of the "non-soul theory" which had denied emphatically the substantiality and

permanence of *pudgala* or *Jīva*. Egoity and personality, however, are admitted as unreal by all orthodox schools. So, by declaring the psychological self as false and fictitious, Buddhism could not show its difference from the Vedic philosophy and religion. The question of distinction and difference arises when one proceeds to find out if there is any permanent and transcendental soul beyond its phenomenal manifestation. The Vedic philosophy gives its view in the affirmative but Lord Buddha is silent on this point. This silence can very well be compared with the *Netivāda* of the Upaniṣadic philosophy, as *Netivāda* in a sense implies silence on the nature of reality. No adjective of the empirical world can be applied to *ātman* and so it is better not to make any attempt to explicate its nature. It does not seem to me that Buddha has denied the existence of a positive and spiritual reality. To taste truth is to be immortal and this immortality can never be a negative term. It is fully concrete and positive. If a positive and permanent spiritual reality is wholly denied then how are we to explain *amritattva* which Lord Buddha himself had sought and discovered ? Here also, by observing "silence" on the question of immortal *ātman*, Buddha has followed only in the footsteps of his predecessors of the Upaniṣadic age. So far as fundamentals are concerned, it is now evident from the materials collected by eminent scholars of the Buddhistic philosophy that it was by no means a deviation from the traditional Upanisadic philosophy and religion.

Reasons behind Lord Buddha's Heresy

The question, therefore, arises : why did Lord Buddha refuse to admit the validity of the Brahmanic literature ? One may also pose a question : how Lord Buddha, despite being profoundly well-versed in philosophy of his age, could openly become anti-Vedic in attitude bearing in mind that his teachings in spirit tallied with the Upaniṣadic philosophy ? The answer can be found out by analysing critically the socio-political atmosphere of his age. The social conditions of

that age were not favourable for the Brahmins who were the sole dominating figures in the pre-Buddhistic age. According to Rhys Davids, warrior class was the most powerful section of the society in the age of Lord Buddha, and the power of the Brahmins paled into insignificance due to their various malpractices. Brahmins of that age were very much in favour of mechanical ritualism only and real philosophical quest was dead among them. The rigid orthodoxy of the Brahmins could not be stopped by the current ideas of the Upaniṣadic philosophy, and their rigorous insistence on *vārṇas* and *āśramas* naturally aroused disgust and hatred in the hearts of free thinkers. While Upaniṣads admitted the sanctity of soul, the so-called followers of the Upaniṣadic philosophy started despising human beings only on the ground of *varṇas*. The period was one of decadence of the Brahmanic religion and not of its expansion. The country needed a new mode of thinking to stop the ritualistic religion of the degenerated Brahmin class. This task was performed by Lord Buddha who gave India a new faith, philosophy and religion at a time when the priests and common people were steeped in narrow religious rites and superstitions. It was, therefore, quite natural of Lord Buddha to differentiate his new religion from the degenerated form of the traditional religion of the Hindus.

Raja Ram Mohun Roy

In modern age, similar socio-religous task was undertaken in the 19th century by the great reformer Raja Ram Mohun Roy who like Lord Buddha, restored the religion of his ancestors to its original purity by introducing the more progressive and reformed religion of the Brahmo Samaj. The central core of Buddha's teaching was to re-orient the Upaniṣadic philosophy with a new emphasis. He was born in the Republic State of the *Śākyas* and he, therefore, automatically imbibed the spirit of freedom which was the accompanying virtue of a republican State. The profound rationality which

found expression in the personality of Lord Buddha was thus due to the political atmosphere in which he was born. He used to declare to his followers : "As the wise takes gold by cutting, burning and rubbing it on a piece of touchstone, so *bhikkus*, you are to accept my words, having examined them and not merely out of your regard for me."

Gospel of Ahimsā

The gospel of *ahimsā* which has become the most valuable gem of Buddhism is also not a new addition to our religion and philosophy. It was recognised as an important virtue even by the orthodox Hinduism of the pre-Buddhistic age. It was because animal sacrifices were too much in practice in the age of Buddha that he vehemently protested against this cruel action and declared *ahimsā* as the supreme virtue.

It is evident from some of the verses of the *Sutta Nipata* that Lord Buddha was not really an antagonist of a true Brahmin ; he was disgusted with the malpractices of the Brahmin class of his age and was against the rigidity of the caste system. If we study the social and political history of Buddha's time, we shall find out that extensive liberalism, strict observance of moral principles, non-observance of caste distinction and a thorough rational outlook, which were the real ornaments of the Buddhistic religion, did not grow in Buddha through the grace of some supernatural agency. Buddha received them from the particular socio-political atmosphere in which he was born and educated. It is therefore, felt that in preparing a history of Buddhistic philosophy, these profound influences of the socio-political factors should be carefully analysed. It is also necessary to emphasise in such study that in essence and fundamentals, Buddhism is not really different from the Upaniṣadic religion of the Hindus. According to Rhys Davids, Buddha was "born and brought up and lived and died a Hindu. Gautama's whole training was based on Brahmanism. He probably deemed himself to be the most correct exponent of the spirit, as distinct from the letter of the ancient faith, and it can

only be claimed for him that he was the greatest and wisest and best of the Hindus."

Philosophy of Śamkara

I shall now briefly refer to the philosophy of Śaṁkara. If Śaṁkara were born in the age of Nāgārjuna, perhaps he would have been a staunch Buddhist and not an *Advaita Vedāntist* of the first order. Some of his thoughts and ideas seem to me to be the "echoes" of Nāgārjuna's "Karikas." Despite so much affinity, Śaṁkara became an *Advaita Vedāntist* because during his time the religion of Buddha was in decay. Śaṁkara's definition of *Nirviśeṣa-Brahma* reminds us of Nāgārjuna's definition of *Tattva* or the ultimate reality given in his famous book *Mādhyamika-Kārikā*. Nagarjuna has defined *Tattva* as that which is calm, blissful, non-dual and harmonious where all plurallty is dissolved and all cries of intellect are stopped. The dialectical arguments used by these two great personalities of two different ages are similar and there is similarity also in their methods of approach. Both held that the supra-intellectual non-dual reality cannot be grasped by the intellect which can proceed by division and dichotomy only. Ultimate reality is "silence" and it has got to be realised directly. Relational intellect working through concepts and categories, can give us only a relative and conditional reality. Ultimately, it is false, because it is different from both *Sat* and *Asat*.

The conditional and relative reality is called *śūnya* by Nāgārjuna and *Anirvacanīya* by Śaṁkara. Both of them have recognised the importance of the empirical world and have tried to give rational justification for its existence. In the *Mādhya-mika-Kārikā*, it has been stated clearly that nobody will be able to reach the ultimate goal, if he neglects altogether the empirical truth of this phenomenal world. It is only through the lower that we can go to the higher.

In a brief article it is not possible to give a detailed analysis of similarities existing between *śūnyavāda* of

Nāgārjuna and *Advaita Vedānta* of Śaṁkara. I shall, however, try to analyse briefly the social and political conditions of India during the time of Śaṁkara and also prior to him. Such analysis, I am sure, will make us understand the reasons for Śaṁkara's allegiance to *Advaita Vedānta* school of Brāhmanic religion.

Age of Śamkara

Just before the arrival of Śaṁkara in the field of ancient Indian philosophy, we find the glorious revival of the Brāhmanic philosophy and Sanskrit literature during the age of the Guptas. In this age, Brahmanism enjoyed imperial patronage and naturally, therefore, it again started exerting the paramount influence on the life, religion and philosophy of our country. This is the age in which we also find the disappearance of kingless republic and the reestablishment of the traditional hereditary monarchy on the soil of our country. The king used to be looked upon as the representative of Lord Viṣṇu, the supposed preserver of the entire world. This sort of political concept is nothing but a legacy of the age-old Vedic religion and tradition which remained in a subdued form during the period of supremacy of the Buddhistic religion. Of course, Brahmanic religion did receive imperial patronage during the reign of Pusyamitra Sunga who was a staunch enemy of Buddhism. It is held that he established a special hermitage for the grammarian Patanjali and encouraged him to write his great book *Mahābhāṣya*. Rights and privileges which the Brahmins lost during the reign of Asoka seem to have been restored to them by the Sunga king Pusyamitra.

The renaissance of the Vedic religion of the Hindus, however, was carried on brilliantly by the Gupta kings who reigned over the soil of India for many years. Hindu philosophy was systematised through their efforts and was also made popular among common people through *Purāṇas* and *itihāsas*. Sanskrit language which to a certain extent lost its

glory during the age of Pali-Buddhism, was again restored to its original position. Even Buddhist philosophers like Dingnāga and Vasuvandhu started writing their books in Sanskrit which was the main language and vehicle of expression of the Brahmanic culture. Buddhism was at that time in a state of decline in Central and Southern India. In that decaying condition, many malpractices and superstitions crept into its body spreading evil influences on all sides. It allied itself with *Śāktism* and Buddha-*tantra* became an important form of *tāntric* religion in our country.

Pressure of Brahminism

The growing pressure of the Brahmanic religion was too much to be resisted by the dying religion of Buddhism and in order to maintain its bare existence, it had to adopt popular practices of the Vedic religion to such an extent that it could hardly be distinguished from being a sect of Hinduism in the 8th century A.D. It was in such an atmosphere that Śaṁkara was born. It is, therefore, evident that Śaṁkara with his great religious zeal should profess the faith of the vedas and the Upanishads which formed the major religious force in India at the time. In spite of his sharp power and logical precision which could find parallel only in Nāgārjuna, he could not adhere himself to Buddhism which was in a decaying state. Naturally, therefore, he came under the banner of Hinduism and began to start strong campaign against Buddhism. It seems to me that Śaṁkara was well aware of the fact that *śūnya-vāda* of Buddhism was not in spirit different from the *Advaita* creed and that is why instead of refuting the doctrine of *śūnya-vāda* on proper logical ground, he took the word *śūnya* in its popular sense of *Asat* and dismissed the theory unjustly in his *Bhāṣya*. Again, although in his philosophical treatise, Śaṁkara appeared as an *Advaita Vedāntist*, believing only in non-dual and characterless absolute ; yet in his actual life, he was a worshipper of God *Śiva* and a follower of the *bhakti* cult.

This apparent anomaly in his life and teachings also could be explained by referring to the historical background of our country in the 8th century A.D. It was in this period that *Vaiṣṇavas* and *Śaivas* of Southern India started fighting against Buddhism and Jainism on the ground of *bhakti* and the cult of *bhakti* too, consequently, gained considerable ground during this period of Indian history. It will, therefore, be not wrong to suppose that Śaṁkara who belonged to the land of *bhakti*, could not overcome the theistic influence and in spite of his allegiance to *Advaita Vedānta*, he became the worshipper of personal God.

From the above discussion, it would be clear that a student of philosophy should be familiar with all these facts of great historical importance so that he is able to grasp easily the movement of thought from one age to another. The great personalities who introduced newer and newer forms of religion were not really the incarnations of God. There was nothing mysterious or inexplicable about them. Each of them appeared on the soil of our country as the result of historical necessity and it is time this aspect of history of philosophy is fully realised and grasped by every student of Indian Philosophy and religion. It is true, the history of Indian philosophy is still in the process of making and the only comprehensive historical record we possess today is the voluminous work by the eminent oriental scholar, late Dr. Surendra Nath Das Gupta. The works of Dr. Radhakrishnan, Dr. Chandra Dhar Sharma and others relate more or less to Indian philosophy in general but not to its historical aspect. In the context of new outlook discussed in this article, we should make a sincere attempt to prepare the history of Indian philosophy of different periods so that important social, political, and economic changes of a particular age may be reflected in a scientific manner. This way alone, we can expect to follow in the best possible manner the historical development of Indian philosophy of different ages.

PHILOSOPHY : INDIAN AND WESTERN

In this short article I wish to discuss critically the philosophical attitudes of India and the West with a view to finding out their points of agreement.

Philosophy in India, as we all know, was never viewed as a mere intellectual endeavour of the human mind to understand the world and its primary cause. On the other hand, the Indian philosophy sprung from an inner urge of human mind to rise above the sorrows and sufferings of this world. The study of the *śāstras* here was always directed towards the attainment of only one important end, i. e., the peace and tranquillity of the mind or the *citta*. The real being of an individual is not sorrow-stricken life of this empirical world : it is the transcendental life which is the timeless truth of all that is happening in time. The spiritual being of man is his essential being ; the shell of flesh and blood is only an artificial adjunct that gets attached to a soul due to *avidyā karma*. It is because of this adjunct that the individual appears as a worldly-being in a pitiable condition and goes through a false process of birth and death, bondage and sufferings for times without number.

Indian Approach

The approach of Indian philosophy to truth and reality is, therefore, essentially moral and practical whereas the approach of the Westerners is essentially intellectual and rational. For example, the *Vaiśeṣika sūtra* has stated that philosophical enquiry should be undertaken so as to attain liberation and also to bring about good of mankind as a whole. The approach through morality does not however mean that Indian philosophy ends in ethical preachings. All ethical rules and precepts which Indian doctrines prescribe aim at transcending morality to attain the supermoral.

In other words, the goal of Indian philosophy lies beyond ethics, logic and psychology. These latter branches of knowledge are all appendages of metaphysics which contain the real key-note of all philosophical speculations. Although Indian philosophy aims at achieving more than what ethics, epistemology and psychology are capable of, yet these branches are necessary as the suitable means of approach to Truth which is supra-moral, transepistemological and metapsychological. In other words, philosophy in India is neither mere intellectualism nor mere moral purism but includes and goes beyond all.

Western Approach

This difference in the approaches of India and the West has created a further gulf in the methods of attainment of philosophical truth of the two countries. In the West philosophical knowledge refers to an intellectual comprehension or intellectual interpretation of the universe as a whole. It is the intellectual curiosity of man regarding the origin, development and goal of life and the universe as a whole which is satisfied by the philosophical knowledge. Hence, in the West, science and philosophy stand hand in hand so far as their origin in the form of intellectual curiosity, motive in the form of intellectual interpretation of the world, and the method of study in the form of reasoning and argumentations are concerned. Difference lies only in the choice of the subject-matter. While science seeks to study the universe, part by part, philosophy makes an attempt to study the universe as a whole. Since like science, philosophy in the West adopts generally the method of reasoning to attain the highest truth, the attainment of philosophical truth here is indirect and inferential and not direct and immediate.

Direct Realisation

When we come to the sphere of Indian philosophy, we find that philosophy here seeks to bring about a change in the

personality of man. Mere intellectual apprehension of Truth about the world is not the real philosophical goal. In order to reach this goal, one should seek to have direct realisation of it in his own experience. Philosophical teaching in India consists essentially in making a man what he was not before. One who acquires *tattva-jñāna*, attains full freedom from the shattering influences of the various impurities of the world. According to Max Muller : 'Philosophy was recommended in India not for the sake of knowledge, but for the highest purpose that man can strive after in this world'. Of course, in India too, science has been regarded as a necessary help to philosophy and like philosophy, science too has sought to give human beings relief from miseries of life ; but a close observation of the motives of science and philosophy in India will reveal a fundamental difference so far as their goals are concerned. Science in India has always remained confined to phenomenal life and phenomenal existence of human beings and has never sought to make them rise above the level of this mundane existence. Sorrows and sufferings that can be removed by application of scientific results are only particular and specific and the removal also is short-lived and temporary. Science only seeks to find out the "how" of a particular sorrow but not its "why". Philosophy, on the other hand, sees through the real nature of pain and seeks to annihilate for good all pains that constantly grind human beings under their pressure. So, science in India is *aparā-vidyā* that helps a man in his day-to-day existence while philosophy is *parā-vidyā* which seeks to find out permanent liberation from the sorrowful worldly-life. The world is a condition of misery and an absolute cessation of world-feeling, therefore, is the goal of Indian Philosophy. The method prescribed for this purpose is the method of meditation resulting in an intuitive realisation of the Supreme Reality. The various terms like *tattvābhyāsa*, *jogābhyāsa*, *dhyāna*, *samādhi* etc. refer to this intuitive and supersensuous method which is supra-intellectual and supra-rational.

The Indian attitude in regard to philosophy can be summed up like this. It emphasises that philosophical endeavours should not stop at the intellectual discovery of truth alone : it should inspire a man to reach a state of enlightenment thereby transforming his behaviour and outlook upon the world. It seems to me that this attitude is a unique contribution of our country to world-culture. When the truth is realised, an individual becomes a new man and is able to see new significance and value in life. Plato, the famous Greek philosopher, said that philosophers alone are fit to be the rulers of a state. He evidently used the word "philosopher" to denote a man whose character has been moulded in the light of knowledge. This is because, in his opinion, a philosopher should be lofty-minded, liberal, pleasant, a lover of truth, justice, courage and temperance. Now everybody will admit that these moral qualities do not spring up in the character of a man merely from an intellectual apprehension of truth...Eradication of all the impurities of life needs strenuous moral discipline resulting in the inner progress of man. Knowing the truth and living through the truth acquired are entirely different. Unless one lives through the truth, it is not possible to attain that freedom and purity of soul which is indispensable for administering justice in every form of state in an impartial manner. If philosophy fails to make us rich, it at least succeeds in making us spiritually free and pure.

A philosopher who has purified his soul and has wedded himself to truth alone, is the best person to serve as the torch-bearer of human civilisation. Thus the differences which are generally noted and quoted by the superificial observers are neither unsurpassable nor unbridgable. A reflection on the nature of the philosophical enquiry of India and the West reveals to us that there is some common ground where the philosophers of both the countries are bound to meet. This

common point is the attainment of tranquillity and peace of mind which can be achieved only when the philosophy of life is rooted in truth and goodness. Self-culture and self-realisation have been highly valued in india as well as in the West. When it is stated that philosophy in the West springs from a love of knowledge, it is not meant to refer to a knowledge that adorns life only externally like an expensive piece of garment : on the other hand, philosophical knowledge in the West too has been believed to be rooted in the deeper soil of life i. e. in truth and goodness, so as to cast a magnificent glow on the character and personality of a man. This is the reason why Plato thinks that philosophers alone should be entrusted with the management of a state.

Socrates has said : "Virtue is knowledge." If a person fully understands the nature of truth, he is sure to pursue it. Without grounding his very being in truth resulting in calmness of mind, a man is absolutely incapable of practising virtues like temperance, justice etc., for the benefit of mankind as a whole. Thus, in the West too, philosophy aims at mental balance or equanimity suitable for the manifestations of various virtues in the life of a person, although this mental harmony is only a rational integration of sensibility and reason and not the tranquillity or transcendental spiritual life which is beyond reason.

Dignity of Man

Again, Indian philosophy too lays a great emphasis on the dignity of man and on the significance and value of social life. It is not indifferent to the life in the world or to the social relations of human beings. Like the humanistic approach of the West, Indian philosophy also is interested in the promotion of ethical ideas with a view to bringing about betterment of social relations in the family of mankind. For this purpose certain common duties are recognised in Indian philosophy which constitute the very foundation of social relations and which are, therefore, to be practised by all persons in all societies without exception. Non-injury or *ahimsā*, *satya* or

truth, *asteya* or non-stealing etc. are the duties which must be followed by everybody to promote social good. Practice of these common duties ennobles human relations by promoting equitable adjustment of relative demands of smaller societies in a larger ethical life of humanity. It is, therefore, incorrect to say that while Western philosophy believes in a philosophy of world and life affirmation, the attitude of an Indian philosopher towards the world is wholly negative. The world is a necessary stage and it is also of supreme moral and sociological significance to work for the benefit of the world through the functioning of a pure will which is wholly free from all passions and prejudices of mind. While a western philosopher like Kant puts stress on the purification of the baser elements of human life by bringing them under the governance of Practical Reason, an Indian philosopher asserts that sensibilities and emotions can be purified only by the burning glow of the Light of the Spirit. It is only through the acquisition of spiritual enlightenment that the entire personality of a man is transformed and consequently he becomes a fit person to work for the betterment of human society in a disinterested manner.

Common Heritage

In the midst of the present day world crisis, it is the imperative duty of every philosopher to bring to the notice of the world such common elements of all systems of philosophy of the East and the West so as to explore regions where all can meet and feel that mankind has a common heritage of culture and civilisation. The gulfs that we see today between the cultures of different countries are really artificial. If we make such an attempt in a manner indicated, it will be possible for us to have a real harmonious integration of different civilisations. This is how the philosophers of all countries will be able to create that atmosphere of interculture harmony in which world solidarity and permanent peace will thrive for ever.

WESTERN AND EASTERN SPIRITUAL VALUES OF LIFE

The Concept of the Spirit and the Spiritual in the West

There is obvious difference between the Eastern and the Western approaches to the philosophical problem of the Spirit and the Spiritual. The Western mind, with its objective bias, refuses to recognize any distinction between the soul, the self and the mind. It is because Consciousness finds its expression through images, ideas and precepts etc. (which are the ingredients of Mind), that the Self or the conscious Principle has been equated with the Mind. Spirit, for the West, is therefore, something which can be known rationally and scientifically, and the existence of which is verifiable in a logical sense.

The being of a Pure Soul, separate from all kinds of psychical functions, has not been admitted in Western philosophy. The Self which has been established by the "*cogito argument*" of Descartes or has been regarded by Locke as the permanent substratum of all mental ideas or has been denied by Hume in favour of an impermanent stream of changing mental states and processes is nothing but a kind of mental substance, the different functions of which fall within the domain of our psychological study. The word 'psychology' too was originally used in the sense of the Science of Psyche or Soul, obviously due to the fact that according to Western definition, the Soul can become the subject matter of a rational and scientific study. The Definition of Psychology as the Science of Consciousness is a recent one, and even then by consciousness the Westerners do not mean Pure and Transcendental Consciousness which is beyond the range of any scientific study. Here consciousness refers to different forms of experience of normal human beings, and as such it is the subject-matter of empirical psychology which is an empirical

science. Bergson, for example, has said : "when we speak of mind, we mean above everything else consciousness." Again, in the opinion of A. C. Ewing, "Mind is used to cover the whole of man's inner nature and not merely his intellectual side... "The notion of a Pure Ego or any substance over and above its qualities, could not be defined in terms of anything else, so how can I know at all what it is like, how can I attach any meaning to statements about it ?" This statement of Mr. A. C. Ewing shows clearly the attitude of the Westerners towards the problem of a pure transcendental soul which can never be known or verified through Logic. Against this background, the term 'spiritual' in the West refers to activities of emotion, will and reason directed towards the external world. In other words, in the West, the mental is equivalent to the spiritual. Due to this identification of the spirit with the mind, the status of the spiritual depends exclusively upon the status given to the mind. If mind is nothing else but brain as has been held by the Realists and the behaviourists of the Western world, then although from a pragmatic point of view we may attach some value to the spiritual, yet from the metaphysical point of view we will be bound to place both on the same level. There can then exist no difference between spirit, mind and matter. Although such identification is the trend towards which the West is gradually advancing, still for the purpose of this paper the word mind should be restricted to normal experience, and a reconciliation between the East and the West will be sought on that basis.

Now, due to this equation of mind and self, perfection of emotion, will-force and reason has become the highest ideal of the West. It is for this reason that they are so eager to enrich life with worldly possessions and to extend its activities as far as possible. They do not realize the significance of eternal life. The Pure Self which is the "Life of life, Hearer of ear, Speaker of all speech, Seer of eye, Mentor of the mind" is only a philosophical fiction for the West:

Śrotrasya śrotram manaso mano yad, vācā ha vācum
Sa u Prāṇasya Prāṇaḥ, Cakṣnṣaḥ Cakṣuḥ :

The West believes firmly that human beings, by themselves, are capable of growing intellectually and morally to such an extent that the whole plan and purpose of the universe can be fully unveiled. With the completion of God's plan in time, an era will come into being when selfish interests will be totally given up and world-harmony can be established on a very sound and unshakable foundation. Perfection of humanity and perfection of the world constitute the final goal of man. It is indeed a very firmly rooted belief of the West that limitations of knowledge of human beings can be completely overcome through the progress of Science, and that things can be arranged in perfectly rational order, thereby satisfying fully the spiritual demands of man. To an Easterner, such a belief is the offspring of a false vanity of the conditioned being, whose very existence is supported wholly by the unconditioned and the Infinite.

The Concept of the Spirit and the Spiritual in the East

The cardinal belief of all Indian philosophy and religion, on the other hand, is that the Supreme Truth is a Being or Existence which is beyond the intellect, ego, mind and all physical appearances we contact in this world. Intellect, ego, mind, etc. are changing principles ; and being changeable, they need an unchangeable consciousness to know them and also to be their support. So, beyond mind, life and body, there is to be found a transcendental and original spirit or self which comprises all that is finite and surpasses all that is relative and conditioned. Nature and Life are only limited manifestations of this Conscious Principle. The upaniṣads have again and again declared that this Supreme Spirit alone is real and that all things and beings of the world have emerged from this Self which is the infinite source of all that appears in the form of this world :

"Karmādhyakṣaḥ sarvabhūtādhivāsaḥ sākṣi cetā kevalo nirguṇaś ca"

"Viśvasya ekam Pariveṣṭitāram Jñātvā devam mucyate sarvapāśaiḥ"

Since the Self is the one Supreme Reality, all life and thought are, in the end, a means towards the realisation of the Self which is the Soul of all souls and the Being of all beings.

Here the spiritual does not mean the mental or the psychical ; on the countrary, it refers to supramental consciousness which is the central core of a human being. This transpsychical, pure, immutable and self-revealing consciousness is not, however, a mere dogma propagated through the Indian scriptures. This has been established firmly on the evidence gathered from the intuitive realisation of the yogins and men of wisdom, and also on the basis of *yukti* or rational argumentations. The consciousness that constitutes the innermost self of man is the only thing spiritual, because it is the spark or reflection of that Great Spirit which forms the transcendental background of all appearances. Spiritual movement, therefore, means movement of Life and Nature towards that Great Ātman which is the Soul of the world.

Each one of us is provided with a life-basis here in this world, and the main end of each one of us should be a movement not only towards a scientific knowledge that aims at revealing the secrets of nature and life, but also towards that liberating knowledge of the Highest Spirit which alone is capable of bringing about a spiritual transcendence and release. Mokṣa is, thus, the only spiritual thing which possesses supreme value of significance, and as such it constitutes the highest *Purushārtha* according to the Indian view. Knowledge of all other things of the world is necessary only as a means to self-realisation. The word 'spiritual' has been used in Indian Philosophy to imply the standpoint of that Great Reality where all relativity and limitations are transcended. The path of the *Śreyas* is the path of self-knowledge and self-realisation. The ethical virtues like self-restraint, transquillity, truthfulness, etc., are of the highest instrumental value, because these moral excellences alone can purify one's mind, thereby preparing it for self-realisation. The highest spiritual

value, however, is beyond the good and evil of worldly life and experience. The ideal is always the spiritual regeneration of man, and as such it is supra-moral and transcendental (Muṇdaka 3.1.).

Distinction between Moral and Spiritual : Indian view.

In India, therefore, there is a difference between Moral and Spiritual values. Since Moral refers to the standpoint of relative existence and Spiritual to the standpoint of transcendental existence, what is of value in the moral sphere appears unimportant in the domain of the spirit. The vision of the spirit may not therefore involve the practice of ethical duties. Still one who develops this vision does as a matter of fact stick scrupulously to the path of virtue.

In fact, moral excellences are generated in the embodied soul or in its *antaḥkaraṇa*. They are the auspicious qualities of empirical life, on the awakening of which the impurities of intellect, emotion and will are totally eliminated. As a result of moral purification, the *citta* or *antaḥkaraṇa* becomes a fit instrument for catching the glimpse of the Highest Reality, which is actually realised through meditation. In the *yogasūtra*, it has been stated that *citta* alone gets coloured with good and evil dispositions. The natural tendency of the river-like *citta* is to flow both for good and evil. So, the moral qualities serve as a sign to indicate the purity of *citta* or *antaḥkaraṇa*. They are not the qualities that belong to spirit in its pure form. Some hold that they are the dispositions of *buddhi* or *citta* as such, whereas according to others, they are generated in the soul in association with *antaḥkaraṇa*. In other words, *antaḥkaraṇa* is either both the generating cause and the substratum of the moral qualities or it is only the generating cause while the embodied soul is the substratum. In both the cases, moral qualities are the qualities of self-conscious living beings who live in the midst of diversified relations. So long as an individual regards himself as an individual living in association with many other individuals, the question of

cultivating the ten *dharmalakṣaṇas* of Manusmriti becomes his primary obligation.

In India the socio-moral good is closely linked with the good of the spirit, and for this reason a four-fold scheme of human life has been prescribed in the *Sūtra* literatures and also in the *Smritis* with detailed instruction for his duties in every stage of life. Relative morality in the forms of domestic, social and political morality is to be cultivated seriously and sincerely because moral qualities in diversified forms constitute the sole basis of the spiritual culture of human beings. The ultimate truth can never be grasped merely by an intellectual endeavour. It is to be realised by the whole of a purified personality—a personality that has passed through different stages of life and has been purified both externally and internally in and through the observance of all scriptural disciplines of mind and body. Truth is something that is to be lived and also made the central ruling principle of thought, life and action. Thus, in India, there has never been any gulf between philosophy and life. One who seeks to know the truth must first of all make his mind pure and clean, and this he will be able to do only if he will follow scrupulously and rigorously the prescribed rules and principles of moral life. This moral life has always been viewed as antagonistic to natural life or Pravṛtti mārga, and so it naturally takes the form of a life of struggle with the grosser aspect of man's life. The natural life is a life in which *sāttvaguṇa* remains in a subdued condition, with the result that it includes all the six passions (lust, anger, greed, pride, infatuation and envy) which stand as obstacles in the path of spiritual progress. Moral life is the life in which all these baser passions are subjugated by the ever-increasing influence of the *sattvaguṇa*. Since *sattvaguṇa* is directly connected with the spirit, the moral life too is harmoniously integrated with the spiritual life. Moral progress, therefore, means gradual realisation of the Good and the Divine in us till at last we get beyond the ethical sphere, and realise the absolute good and attain

liberation. The best instrument to be used for the purpose of conquering the evil passions of a natural life is the cultivation of the spirit of *aparigraha* which constitutes the foundation of Indian civilisation and culture. In the negative aspect *aparigraha* implies giving up the spirit of "selfish monopoly" after realising the evil that results from such greed. In the positive sense on the other hand, it means giving every man what is his due, and also administering justice to all in a spirit of Love and Service. In other words, *aparigraha* is synonymous with *vairāgyo* which implies total renunciation of the ego-centric spirit. It is the firm belief of an Indian mind that nobody can do good either to himself or to society as a whole unless he cultivates the moral power of renouncing his own worldly happiness in favour of a higher truth and the happiness that results from it.

Views of the West

In the West, no distinction has been drawn between mind and spirit or between two kinds of knowledge—transcendental and empirical. Therefore, for them morality or spirituality means fulness, richness and nobility of the human mind. Christ was a man of this world and He was the repository of all moral values. To awaken all the moral values in life is, therefore, the highest spiritual and moral end of man. "Christ is born and Christ spirit must be formed in men". Personal passions and affections should not be given up and the distinct sense of individuality should not be destroyed. The goal of man is to unfold in freshness and fulness his own fine and noble personality in and through his various worldly relations. Dr. E. Caird, for example, has said that a philosophy or theology which teaches men to abandon all earthly concerns and to uproot all passions and desires for the purpose of entering into an intimate relation with God simply means "an attempt to go empty-handed into an empty house". The thinkers of the Western world find it difficult to understand how man can have a higher nature which is not limited to the mind, and which is being continuously manifested

through various functions of life. This is because the psychological study of the west has, so far, been able to discover in its own way the secrets of waking, dream and dreamless states of the mind. The fourth and the *turiya* state in which pure consciousness is directly grasped is still beyond the sphere of Western psychology. The spiritual values of the West are, therefore, empirically fashioned, and they have been identified with moral values, which are to be cultivated in the midst of worldly conditions and worldly relations.

Difficulties in the Way of Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Spiritual Values.

From what has been stated above, it is clear that the fundamental metaphysical difference relating to the true nature of the Spirit or the individual soul is such that both India and the West have failed to appreciate mutually the merits and excellences of these two philosophical traditions.

To an Indian, the so called spiritual values of the West are simply the values of the moral life which is a life of struggle between the opposite tendencies of *citta* or mind. Ethics belongs to this worldly life, and its value lies in the fact that it is the only avenue to the realm of the supra-moral values of the life of the Spirit.

The West, on the other hand, is not willing to believe that everything belonging to our empirical consciousness is of a limited value, that our affections, bonds of friendship, great moral courage, sense of self-respect and dignity, etc., have only limited ends, and that for higher spiritual values, these should be left behind. Spiritual transcendentalism is something that is unintelligible to the West ; and for that reason, they very often declare that Indian philosophy preaches asceticism leading to a total renunciation of this world.

Reconciliation

If we ponder deeply over philosophical positions of both India and the West, we will certainly discover a meeting

ground where the two philosophical traditions can be brought together to form a sanctified confluence of the East and the West.

In the first place, we should remember that in India, due to the distinction between the empirical life and the life of the pure spirit, a chasm seems to have emerged between moral values and values of the transcendental life ; but this is more apparent than real. Spiritual values are nothing but the final flowering of the moral values, without which the highest spiritual development cannot be dreamt of. Just as will, intellect and emotion are inseparable for the highest psychological development of man, in the same manner moral and spiritual values are inseparably integrated. A man's life in this world as well as his various social relations are fully recognized ; and it is also asserted repeatedly that a man should first of all discharge properly all his duties and attain the ethical ideal before he can become fit for the Life of the Spirit. In the *Śūtra* literatures as well as in the *Smritis*, we can find a strong and positive outook on life which is chiefly concerned with social good, social stability and general well-being of the people. The maintenance of social order is a very important topic in the *Rājadharma* section of the Mahābhārata where Bhiṣma advises Yudhiṣṭhira to be morally and physically strong enough to punish all transgressions of social and political laws. Like the humanistic approach of the West, India, too, is interested in the promotion of moral virtues with a view to bringing about a betterment of social relations in this huge family of mankind. It is the practice of moral duties which alone can promote equitable adjustment of relative demands of smaller societies in a higher ethical life of humanity. The world is not to be despised, but it is to be looked upon as the necessary stage for preparation for the highest attainment. Here, the Westerners, who believe in the spiritualisation of human flesh as well as the worldly life, can join hands with the people of India who, too, believe in the transformation of the natural life to the

pure life of *Sāttvika-bhāvanā*, where moral excellences bloom forth in their bright radiance and pure glory. Though *Sattvaguṇa* does not constitute the nature of Spirit, yet it has direct contact with Pure Consciousness. In the yoga philosophy, *Sattvaguṇa* has been treated as the *upādhi* of God. From this point of view, even though India does not believe that the moral and the spiritual are identical, still, being a believer in the close intimacy between *Sattvaguṇa* and Pure Consciousness, the Indian view does come very near to the Western conception of spiritualisation of the baser emotions of the human mind.

Moreover, the West too believes in the crucifixion of the flesh ; and if this expression has any moral significance, it means nothing but giving up of the selfish pursuit of gross and individual pleasures. This is both the moral and the spiritual goal of the West, because in the opinion of the West there is nothing else than perfection of humanity to which the highest spiritual value can be accorded. This perfection, the West seeks to attain in and through the family-life, the political life and also the life of society as a whole. In order to do so, the westerner too has got to expand his own self so as to cover the life of the community. Unless one identifies one's self with the self of another person he can never sacrifice his own good for the good of that person. Identification lies at the very root of all altruistic feelings and emotions. The altruistic spirit is prominently present in Western Philosophy. Only the Westerners do not believe in the Indian ideal of *Vasudhaiva kutumbakam,* because in their view, there is no transcendental soul which can be regarded as the soul of all finite souls. But if we can believe in the identification of an individual mind with the mind of a whole society, there is no reason why we should feel lost when we are advised to identify our individual souls with the soul of the whole universe. A Western mind may shudder at this very idea, thinking that this is equivalent to depriving his own self of all the good of this earthly life and reducing his blessed existence to a state which is as good

as non-existence. This idea is wholly wrong. Indian philosophy, too, does not advocate such emptiness as the ultimate goal. It simply teaches us to go on expanding our soul in a manner that it becomes large enough to cover the whole kingdom of living beings and non-living things. Limited possessions as well as partial conquest of the world can give us only limited happiness. If we can win over the whole of Life and Nature, our bliss and happiness will know no bounds. If the West makes a sincere endeavour to expand its self with a view to covering at least the whole world of mankind, she can come very close to the teachings of the Indian scriptures. If the West is not willing to give up her sense of egohood, then let her develop the sense of ownership of the whole world so as to be able to have the feeling of becoming the all and the great. The West has already learnt the lesson of "dying to live", and this means nothing but the process in which an individual soul goes on becoming larger and larger. He dies to his narrow limited self to live the life of a larger self. This is exactly what Indian spiritualism means when it desires the abolition of the narrow sense of egoity and the development of the spiritual capacity of treating all on an equal footing. *Samadriṣti* implies nothing but the expansion of self to become the Self of all. The only thing is that the expanded self in Indian view covers both spirit and matter, ego and non-ego, both of which are the manifestations of the Original Self. This sort of conception too is not foreign to the Western idealist who declares that the so-called antithesis between ego and non-ego is ultimately reconciled in God, as there is reason in both. If the West can be made to realise that the Indian spirit of *vairāgya* does not imply "other-worldliness" and that Indian spiritualism, too, is not antimoral,—if the West can accept that the Indian attitude to the worldly life is strongly positive and that the spiritual values depicted here are the final fulfilment of the moral values,—then the West will surely feel a close affinity with Indian spiritualism.

In the midst of the present day world crisis, it is, therefore, the imperative duty of every philosopher to bring to the notice of the world such common elements of all systems of philosophy of the East and the West, so as to explore regions where all can meet and feel sincerely and fully that mankind has a common heritage of culture and civilization.

SPIRITUALITY—INDIAN AND AMERICAN: A REPLY

The article on "Spirituality—Indian and American" by Mr. Wilson Organ, published in the January 1961 issue of the *Philosophical Quarterly* needs, in my opinion, a convincing reply. It is written in a popular style. Mr. Wilson Organ is certainly competent to state the American view-point on the subject and in the manner he has done. When however I find that he has made certain reference with regard to Indian spirituality and that too in a light manner, I feel, it is my duty as an Indian to try to remove any wrong impression which might have been created in the minds of some of his readers. On page 245 of the journal mentioned he has stated that he was shocked to hear at the 1958 Session of the Indian Philosophical Congresss that in the Sannyasin stage of life, one does not need love : in his opinion such a view is against the teachings of modern psychology according to which "the human being never outgrows the need for love."

In my opinion, the Indian view about the stage of sannyās does not appear to be in conflict with the teachings of modern psychology. In India sannyās represents a particular state of mind in which the soul has a direct taste of the Life Divine. In this stage, the desires of the heart are completely renounced and the individuul becomes wholly dispassionate and detached in spirit. Although he is detached, he is not isolated from the world. By isolation we mean isolation in spirit only. Since he has no desire for worldly pleasures, the so-called emotional indulgences of this world lose all charm and significance for him. His mind finds delight in the Supreme and he seeks refuge only in the Supreme. At heart he is unaffected by worldly losses and gains, love and hate, hope and despair. His whole heart which rests in the Supreme is peaceful, balanced and free. I am quite sure that a modern psychologist will not deny that if such a mental state could be

attained, then in that state a man could become absolutely indifferent to worldly love and hate. It is, of course, true that an ordinary human being does not outgrow the need for love, but a true sannyāsin in the Upaniṣadic sense is an *extraordinary person* who has risen above the consciousness of the body-mind to the realisation of the Supreme Being. Modern psychology does not deal with such an extraordinary and super-normal mind. It deals simply with the normal and abnormal constitutions and reactions of minds of ordinary persons.

I can appreciate the difficulty of an American to understand our viewpoint when we say that the true sannyāsin is nothing but a symbol of love and compassion for the whole creation. This love is not the narrow and limited love of an ordinary man. He does not become too much attached to anybody. To him all are equally lovable, because all are the sparks of the same Life Divine which is the main object of his devotion and adoration. In fact, the true sannyāsin gives away his whole heart to the Highest Being, and receives also inspiration and encouragement from that source alone. Since the love of a sannyasin is directed towards the object of Supreme Value, he naturally becomes indifferent to all worldly things and events. But this does not mean that he is hard-hearted. On the contrary, the taste of Divine Love melts his heart in such a manner that he always feels love and compassion for all and eagerly extends his help to human beings whenever they are in distress. His equal treatment without any partiality for any particular soul may outwardly seem to be a sort of indifference ; actually speaking, it is a form of self-less love which is devoid of all sorts of egocentric attachment. Such true love can flood the heart of that person only who has tasted Divine Love.

On page 245, para 3, he remarks : "Spirituality for Indians means anti-materialism." Again on page 246, para 1, he says, "The American view of human life does not separate the material and the spiritual as does the Indian."

I am afraid, this is a very superficial criticism. It is not correct to say that Indian spiritualism is anti-materialism. In fact, Indians also do not admit an absolute separation between the material and the spiritual. Material happiness and comforts are no doubt necessary, but they are of an inferior value. The highest value lies in the realisation of the spirit which is the essential being of man. Life begins in a material world, and this material world does charm a man, nourish him, and provide him with all the material necessities of life. The soul itself remains wrapped up in a material covering—a covering to which we have got to give such importance as is its legitimate due. But man has got to realise his inner essence which is of the nature of the spirit. The realisation of this spirit constitutes the highest goal of Indian life. It is a case of transcendence, and not of antagonism, between spiritualism and materialism. As one ascends higher in the scale of spirituality, his material happiness gets transformed into the happiness of the spirit. At the ordinary stage, the happiness of the soul remains mixed up with the happiness of the world ; and in that stage, the happiness of the world gets prominence. This is the natural law of worldly life. Barring Cārvāka, no other system of Indian philosophy has given an independent significance to the material principle. Even in Saṅkhya, Prakṛti becomes meaningful only when it is intelligised by puruṣa. Materiality is always deriving its significance from spirituality with which it remains in association. It is the spiritual which is of the highest value : so even in the case of material enjoyment and worldly actions, an adherence to spirituality must be prominent. *This is our Indian Culture.*

In another place he has stated that Indian philosophy teaches that a person must be poor and hungry in order to be spiritual and that attention to the needs or desires of the physical body necessarily disqualifies a person for spirituality. This impression of the writer is wholly wrong. Indian philosophy merely teaches that man should not regard

material happiness as the ultimate goal of life and should not therefore get too much attached to material happiness emotionally, because in that case he will be psychologically incapable of giving his best attention to the spirit which is his real essence. In fact, one who realises that spirit alone is of supreme value becomes naturally indifferent to those things which he considers to be of inferior value. For that reason, it does not matter whether a free soul lives in a palace or under a tree. Janaka was a King, but he was also the knower of the Ultimate Truth.

Mr. Wilson Organ has quoted words of Swami Vivekananda :

"In the West they are trying to solve the problem of how much a man can possess, and we are trying to solve the problem on how little a man can live". What Vivekananda referred to is the virtue of *aparigraha*, which means a dispassionate attitude to material prosperity through the perception of its being tainted by cruelty and other defects. This is one of the most essential virtues of man according to the Indian view. It is the belief of Hinduism that all sorts of evils—social, political, moral, etc..—are the results of greed.

TANTRA CULT IN INDIA

It is a well-known fact that in India what we call Tantrism existed even in the Vedic period. The Atharva practice of sacrifices and chanting of Mantras for the performance of magic and miracles did occupy an important place in early Indian history and culture. It is therefore, quite reasonable to hold that through a prolonged practice, all these magic-spell aud charms eventually developed and amalgamated into what we call "Tantrism."

If we study ancient Indian history, we find two different uses of the word "Tantra." In the wider sense, Tantra refers to any science, capable of spreading knowledge. This is the root meaning of the word and it has actually been used in this sense in the Mahabharata. Nyaya, Samkhya, Yoga etc. are called Tantras in this sense. The word, however, has also a very limited and technical sense. When used technically, it refers to that branch of knowledge in which characters, qualities and actions of gods are described and Mantras are also uttered with the help of which and also with the help of symbolic figures (Yantra) gods are invoked, worshipped and meditated upon in a specially formulated esoteric manner by the initiated ones only. Thus, there is a sort of mysticism veiling and hiding the real treasure of Tantra-religion from the general mass of the people. Disciplines needed for Tantric Sadhana are difficult and cannot be practised by a man without proper initiation. A Tantric preceptor has got to make discrimination in the matter of choosing disciples.

Philosophy of Tantricism

Tantra-religion, usually grounded on "Advaita-philosophy," is a path specially schemed for the realisation of "one-ness" and unity amidst apparent diversity of the world.

The psychological make-up of the human mind is such that man finds it difficult to cling to a principle which is

beyond thought and imagination and which can be approached through intellect only and not through love and emotion. But desire for happiness, for pleasures and well-being is very intense and deep-rooted in man. So he is always in search of some such path which will lead him to bliss and happiness and will at the same time be more impressive and more appealing to him. Thus, the religion of Tantra with its emotional aspect together with the Mantras and Yantras was able to catch the imagination of a large section of people, who were not prepared to follow the path of knowledge and pure intellect.

Utterance of Mantras used to have a special significance in Indian philosophy and religion.. "Śabda" is supposed to be the creative force of the universe. It has its origin in the imaginative power of Brahman. Imagination is a function of mind and all functions of mind are performed through words, uttered or unuttered. Imagination without "Śabda" is, thus, absolutely meaningless. So the world is made of "Śabda" and "Śabda" emanates directly from the highest principle. It is the creative energy, lying at the root of the world formation. So, through "Nāda," "Śabda" or Mantra, one is able to reach reality, Therefore, Mantra occupies a unique position in all forms of symbolic and image-worship in India. "Nyāsa" Tantra is also based on this truth. By means of Nyāsa, consciousness is generated and felt all over the body and the worshipper is able to realise that he is all consciousness—pure and self-illuminating.

Śākta-Tantra & Devi-Śūkta

"Śākta Tantra" like all other tantras owes allegiance to "Advaita-philosophy". Since Brahman in its pure, transcendental form is immutable, undifferentiated and unchangeable, it admits the existence of Śakti or Creative Energy as the source of life and existence of the universe. Śākta-Tantra. is based on the Devi-Sūkta of Vāk—the daughter of Ambhrin. The follower of Śākta-Tantra reaches his highest goal when

he realises his oneness with the Devi—the inexhaustive source of the whole universe.

The first Sūkta of Devi-Sūkta describes this creative energy as the underlying force of the phenomenal world. All physical and psychical categories of the world are nothing but its different manifestations. This creative force is the support of the eleven *Rudras* which are nothing but the symbolic forms of five organs of sensation, five of action and mind. These sense-organs are called *Rudras* as they are respectively the recipients of sensations, doers of actions and experiencers of pleasures and pains. It is because of these sense-organs that a man receives impressions from the external world aad acts accordingly as a result of which feelings of pleasures and pains arise in his mind. This creative energy is described as the support of all wealth and power (Vasu) Dharma and Adharma, pleasures and pains (Indra and Agni). (All these are, however, represented by the names of the various gods.) In short the whole of the world has come into being from the womb of the Great Energy. It is, therefore, called Mahāmāyā, Mahā avidyā etc. in the *Chandi* and it is also the most beloved object of worship in the religion of the Śaktās.

Mental Conditions

Śākta-Tantra recognises three different mental conditions to suit them. The three mental conditions are *Paśu bhāva : Vīra bhāva* : and *Divya bhāva.* When one lives wholly in ignorance and has no knowledge of ultimate reality, he is only a *Paśu* or *jīva* in the grip of *pāśa* (snare). This is the lowest level and in this stage a man is advised to perform *Vedācāra, Vaiṣṇavācāra, Śaivacara* and *Dakshiṇācāra. Vīra bhāva* is the next higher stage. In this stage, a man is able to grasp (although vaguely) the principle of "advaita" and he is, therefore, in a position to make an attempt to free himself from bondage aad sufferings of life. Disciplines prescribed for this stage are *Varṇācāra and Siddhāntācāra.* The highest stage is called the stage of *Divya bhāva.* This is

attained when a man is able to merge himself completely in the *Advaita*-principle which is the ultimate refuge of the whole universe. Discipline prescribed for this stage is called *Kaulācāra*. The follower of *Kaulācara* is a person who has full realisation of the oneness of the world. He is above all sorts of discrimination and distinction. He sees *Advaita* in all things and all things in the *Advaita* principle.

Kaulācāra & Pañca Makāra

The word *Kaula* is derived from Kula which stands for Kundalinī-śakti. Śiva is called *Akula*. A Kaulācāri is able to rouse up *Kula-śakti* by means of *Yogavidyā* and is also able to unite *Kula* with Akula thereby effecttng unity in diversity, *Advaita* in *Dvaita*. Practice of *Kaulācāra* needs five things, each one of which has *makāra* as its initial. These are *Madya : Māṁsa : Matsya* : *Mudrā* and *Maithun*. The secret of these *Pañca Makāra* is not known to all. These names are really symbolic, standing for certain spiritual acquisitions and are not to be taken in their literal senses. A *Kaulācāri* is supposed to drink wine : but here "wine" stands for the nectar which flows from the lotus of the head when through spiritul elevation, the Yogi is able to bring about the blissful union between *Kula and Akula* or *Śakti* and *Śiva*. *Puṇya* and *Pāpa* are two *Paśus* and as a *Kaulācāri* is expected to kill both of them with his weapon of knowledge he is called a meat-eater. *Puṇya* and *Pāpā*, *Dharma* and *Adharma* belong to this worldly life. Man can realise oneness and unity only when he transcends and goes beyond them. The two veins *Iḍā* and *Pingalā* are called *Gangā* and *Yamunā*. The process of breathing in and breathing out are known as *Matsya* (Fish). A *Kaulācāri* needs to have full control over the processes of breathing.

He is therefore supposed to be an eater of fish. Shunning a bad company and seeking a good one is called *Mudra-Sandhāna* and a *Kaulācāri* is expected to be in a good company, suitable for the purpose of his esoteric practice. The intercouse or union between the vein *Susumnā* and vital

force of the body is called *Maithun.* This is the highest and the purest form of happiness attainable in iife.

We find that the spiritual significance of *Panca Mākara* is of a high order. As these spiritual processes are mentioned through symbols, the disciple needs the help of a good teacher who will be able to explain and make clear to him the deep-rooted meaning of all *Ācāras.* It is because of this esoteric practice and mystic nature of *Tantricism* that it is so widely misunderstood and misinterpreted. The ugly distortions of *Tantra* in various ways are responsible for many evils that have crept into the blood-stream of our social life. *Pañca Makāra* is ordinarily interpreted in liberal sense and consequently Śākta-Tantra is supposed to provide a man with an unlimited scope for sex-indulgence and other forms of licentious life. A true *Kaulācāri* is never a libertine. He has to practise strict moral discipline and observe rigorous moral rules for the realisation of spiritual freedom and elevation. It is stated in the *Meru-Tantra* that if a man wishes to be a follower of *Kula-Mārga,* he must behave like a blind person so far as other's properties are concerned, must be a neuter in the presence of another's wife and must have self-control in all matters of sense-enjoyment. The need for sense-control and self-control is, thus, no less important here than in other forms of Indian religion.

THE KARMA-YOGA OF SWAMI VIVEKANANDA

Swami Vivekananda was a true seeker and lover of Brahman—the Bliss. In his opinion, *lokasaṇgraha*, the magnificent social expression of divine love, was an excellent form of worship of the Supreme. He believed that, through sheer selfless and disinterested humanitarian service, a person can reach the supreme goal coveted by the wise. Swami Vivekananda has wonderfully harmonized the path of selfless service with the path of knowledge. He has also offered us a unique interpretation of Advaita Vedanta, keeping in view both the fundamental position of the Advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara and the pressing demands of the new world. Such a work is only possible by a super-normal personality with a penetrating insight. For the first time, Swamiji gave us the idea that both spirituality and service are complementary ideals of the Vedānta, and that Advaita Vedānta is capable of bringing into harmony all religions, only when both spirituality and service are regarded as twin principles of this order.

Advaita Vedānta as Commonly Understood

The general view regarding Advaita Vedānta is that according to this school, knowledge alone constitutes the direct means to liberation. Selfless service simply purifies the soul and makes it fit for receiving spiritual knowledge. One who has entered into the stage of *sannyāsa* gives up all forms of actions, as actions are meaningless to him in the final stage. The results that issue forth from actions are non-eternal. The *sannyāsin*, who with a purified mind has engaged himself in the search for eternal Truth, has naturally no need for various worldly things, including the results of actions (which are only transitory and non-eternal). Actions or fruits of actions can be of four forms : *utpāda*, *āpya*, *saṁskārya* and *vikārya*.

In the case of *utpādya-karma*, the material stuff produces an effect without undergoing any change in its nature—as for example, cloth produced from threads. When the action does not produce any change in the object of the action, it is known as *āpyakarma*—as Devadatta's seeing the jar. When the action produces some *saṁskāra* of specific quality in the object of the action, it is called *saṁskārya-karma*. As for instance, in order to make the sacrificial cake, one has got to sprinkle water on the unhusked rice. In *vikārya-karma*, the material cause undergoes modification to produce the effect ; for example, milk changing into curd.

But Brahman is uncaused, ever attained, eternal, pure, devoid of change, and imperfection. So, it cannot be regarded as any one of these four forms of action or fruits of action ; and if *Barhmaprāpti* is not the result of any kind of action, then why should one, seeking to attain the highest and the greatest only, desire to follow the path of action ?

Tasmāt na karmāsādhyatvaṁ
Bramaṇo'sti kutaścana :
Karmasādhyaṁ tvanityaṁhi
Brahmanityaṁ Sanātanaṁ
(*Sarva-Vedānta-Siddhānta-Sāra-Saṇgraha*)

Knowledge alone is the gateway to liberation and there is nothing else that can lead a man straightway to his desired goal.

Jñānādeva tu kaivalyam
Iti śrutya nigadyate ; ... ...
Mumukṣor yujyate tyāgaḥ
Kathaṁ vihitakarmaṇah ;
Iti śaṅkā na kartavyā
Mūḍhavat paṇḍitottamaiḥ (*ibid*).

This is how the Advaita Vedānta of Śankara is generally interpreted and understood by the teachers and the taught of Indian philosophy.

Karma-Yoga As Interpreted
By Swami Vivekananda

Now, let us see how the great Swami Vivekananda has interpreted *karma-yoga* so as to synthesize service with knowledge, both of which, in his opinion, are equally potent to lead a man to his desired goal (i.e. freedom of the soul or *mokṣa*). Swamiji has declared emphatically that the grandest idea of the Vedānta is its synthetic view so far as paths to liberation are concerned. 'The grandest idea in the religion of the Vedānta is that we may reach the same goal by different paths and these paths I have generalized into four—viz. those of work, love, psychology, and knowledge. Each blends into the other. These divisions are made according to the type or tendency that may be seen to prevail in a man. In the end, all these four paths *converge and become one.*' The general view of the Advaitins that knowledge and action cannot meet together (*jñānakarmanoḥ sahayogaḥ na ghaṭate*) has not found favour with this great *karmayogin* of India. On the other hand, Swamiji has taught us that action, understood in its proper spirit, can be synthesized very effectively with knowledge, and that there is no antagonism between the two. The only thing that is essential for us to do is to learn the secret of *karma-yoga*.. Action in itself, is neither good nor bad. It has no inherent moral qualities. It becomes good or bad, efficacious for freedom or obstacle to freedom, only due to purity or impurity of motive from which it springs. If the motive behind an action is selfish, it is bad ; if the motive is wholly unselfish, the action is both good and conducive to spiritual freedom. The secret of *karma-yoga* is nothing but spiritualisation of service by cultivating the attitude of selfiess devotion to life divine. The pursuit of *karma-yoga* lies in making action free of all *rājasika* interests, and also, in shifting the motive from narrow egoism to the infinite bliss that supports the whole world. Action, performed in this attitude of humility, devotion, and selfless love for the whole universe, is nothing but

a form of spiritual *sādhanā* which is wholly beneficial to liberation. In his eagerness for proving the efficacy of *karma-yoga*, Swamiji has gone so far as to declare : 'The *karmayogin* need not believe in any doctrine whatsoever. He may not believe even in God, may not ask what his soul is, nor think of any metaphysical speculation. He has got his own special aim of realizing selflessness ; and he has to work it out himself. Every moment of his life must be realization, because he has to solve by mere work, without the help of doctrine or theory, the very same problem to which the *jñānin* applies his reason and inspiration and *bhakta* his love.'

If we reflect deeply on *karma-yoga* as interpreted by Vivekananda, and also by Śri Kṛṣṇa in the *Gitā*, we find that selfless action is the dynamic side of spiritual freedom which is already an accomplished fact. It is not a fact that spiritual freedom arises as an effect from selfless service. Unless one has made his soul wholly free from the distracting influence of egoism and narrow individuality, he is not to be called a perfect *karmayogin*. It is the sense of egoism (*ahaṅkāra* and *abhimāna*) that really constitutes the bondage of the soul. To remove this egoism, one has to have recourse to *karma-yoga*, which cleanses the soul of its defilement, and thereby, reveals its essentially free nature. So, in this case also, removal of the obscuring tendencies of *avidyā* by means of constant performance of selfless actions simply helps one to open the closely tight cover of the golden pot in which the nectar of immortality is to be found in abundance. The freedom of the soul is always present. It is not a thing to be acquired ; it has only to be revealed by the practice of *karma-yoga*. As there is no cause-effect relationship between knowledge and spiritual freedom, so also there is no such relationship between *karma-yoga* and the freedom of the soul. Both knowledge and selfless service are capable of removing *avidyā* that hides the real nature of Ātman by covering it with the dark spell of egoism. Destruction of this egoism is *mokṣā*. *Avidyā* and egoism constitute two points of view from

which the root cause of bondage can be visualized and verbalized.

Since destruction of egoism is necessary for the proper performance of selfless action, a *karmayogin*, too, is in a position to attain liberation by following the path of egoless actions. The Advaita Vedānta does not preach that action under all conditions is a snare and that the world is to be dismissed as an illusion. Action is not to be renounced totally ; rather it is to be performed in the world with the inner life wholly dedicated to the eternal spirit.

Śankara and Selfless Service

Śaṅkara's view on selfless action has been very aptly elucidated by him in his commentary on the *Bhagavad-Gītā*. Inertia is not freedom, and freedom, also, does not logically lead to inertia and inactivity. Commenting on the second *śloka* of the sixth chapter of the *Gītā* Śaṅkara has said ; *Asti paramārtha sannyāsena sādṛśyaṁ kartṛdvārakaṁ karmayogasya.*' That is to say, there is similarity between *sannyāsa* and *karma-yoga* since, in both, the giving up of ego-sense is absolutely necessary. *Karma-yoga* can be linked with the stage of *sannyāsa* in which the wise sage will perform actions not for his own welfare (not even aiming at his own *cittaśuddhi* for liberation) but for the welfare of the whole of mankind. Just as a true *karmayogin* gives up the habit of doing actions for his own self, rejecting completely the idea of his separate being, in the same manner. the enlightened person gives up the habit of doing such actions which result from the false identification of the soul with the limited body-mind system. Whenever Śaṅkara has described the relation between knowledge and action as one of opposition, he has considered action in the sense of deeds performed with the intention of enjoying pleasures and happiness of this world or of the other world. Total annihilation of the feeling of *sva* (mine) is absolutely necessary for spiritualization of service.

In fact, Śaṅkara has admitted that there is no objection to the performance of selfless action, even after the attainment of wisdom (see Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Gītā*, III, 8, 20). In the stage of *sannyāsa*, the soul loses all ego-centric hankerings for worldly pleasures, and for that reason, the ordinary incentives to worldly actions no longer exist for him. He forsakes completely his habit of doing actions in the worldly-way, and hence he is a doer of action in name only. Truly speaking, the doer of action is one who thinks of himself as the sole agent and designer of the deed due to ignorance. When one is free from ignorance, his action assumes the form of *sādhanā* and ceases to be a source of bondage. To link one's life with the life of divinity is not only to lose one's existence as an individual, but also to regain one's reality as egoless spirituality. His psycho-physical frame, then, assumes for him the form of a spiritual lyre, each string of which is attuned to the great music of the world. Whatever he does, at once, changes into divine service performed through his mind-body system. Hence, there is no incompatibility between *Jñāna-yoga* and *karma-yoga*, even though Vedānta declares that in the stage of *sannyāsa*, there is the destruction of *karma*, meaning thereby the destruction of all actions springing from the sense of individuality and egoism. This is, indeed, a stage when a person can be admitted as a non-doer even though he performs humanitarian services. Separateness of the deed from the doer exists only so long as the sense of egohood persists. But when a person has no sense of I and mine, he has no sense of ownership of actions, and consequently, he has no feeling of separation between himself and his action. He is divine, his action is also divine, and there is nothing for him but Divinity manifesting itself through sights and sounds, love and hate, knowledge and services of the world.

In the *Naiṣkarmya-Siddhi*, it has been stated that, just as a lamb cannot stay in the same place with a lion without being devoured by it, in the same manner, knowledge and

action cannot be linked together due to their incompatible nature.

Here, too, the author of the said text has meant by action only those which spring from a false sense of agency, due to beginningless ignorance. When an individual has made himself totally free from the sense of agency, he does nothing, even though he keeps himself engaged in disinterested social service. Social service, discharged in a spirit of detachment or divine service, can never be regarded as a snare, because this type of work is not prompted by the individual's desire for his own happiness (*svakalyāṇa buddhi*). Even God acts in this world for the sake of world maintenance and progress. Just as God never becomes bound by his actions, in the same manner, the *sannyāsin*, who has emptied himself of all egocentric desires, does not bind himself by his egoless actions. As he has no selfish motive, he lays claim to nothing and surrenders himself wholly to the supreme Being. Action, understood in this sense, has no antagonism with knowledge and is, therefore, not destructible by knowledge. In fact, service is nothing but knowledge viewed from the dynamic aspect of life.

Conclusion

Thus, from the above discussion, it is clear that service can be synthesized wih knowledge even from the Advaitic point of view, if by service we mean only those actions which are done by the wise sage for *lokasaṅgraha*. Actions are not his duties in the sense that they are obligatory on him. On the other hand, any humanitarian service done by the wise is a spontaneous manifestation, in a dynamic form, of the nectar of wisdom that he has drunk. He becomes the master of all actions by cultivating detachment and faith in the Absolute. The freed soul works for the guidance of men who are still steeped in ignorance. He is the doer of work and is yet not the doer, because he has no sense of 'I' and 'mine'.

If the individual soul is Brahman (as has been asserted by the Advaita Vedānta), then service to individual soul (*jīva*) is service to Brahman. The individual soul is the symbol (*pratīka*) through which Brahman is worshipped. The individual soul is, however, associated with the body-mind organism, and so, this body-mind organism must be properly nursed and purified if any real service is to be rendered to the indwelling spirit. Keeping this in view, the wise sage works spontaneously for the betterment of all the living conditions of the *jīva*.

Hence, from this point of view, the humanitarian services performed by a *sannyāsin* are nothing but the spontaneous fulfilment of the divine purpose through a perfected personality. The secret of *karma-yoga* is the annihilation of *ahaṁkāra* and the attunement of one's being to the purpose of divine life. Service in a detached spirit is the outer side of spirituality and knowledge is the inner side. So, the two can go together as the outer and inner aspects of the same spiritual process. The very subtle metaphysical distinction between the self-effacement of *niṣkāma-karma* and the self-negation of *Brahma-jñāna* loses its meaning when viewed from the standpoint of psychology and practical life.

Even Śaṅkara had to work hard for re-organising Hindu society on the new model of Advaita Vedānta, although he was a *jīvanmukta puruṣa*. He had also founded *mathas* in various places so as to facilitate propagation of his views among masses in different parts of India. When Śaṅkara himself did so much humanitarian service in his own life, how can it be proper for us to maintain that the stage of *sannyāsa* is a stage of perfect inactivity ? Swami Vivekananda has rightly remarked : 'The Vedānta...as a religion must be intensely practical. We must be able to carry it out in every part of our life. And not only this, the fictitious differentiation between religion and the life of the world must vanish for the Vedānta teaches oneness of life throughout. The ideals of religion must cover the whole field of life, they must

enter into our thoughts and more and more into practice. When truth is fully realized, realization finds spontaneous expression through thought, feeling, and emotion of the perfected personality inspiring him to undertake magnificent service for human good.

Of course, it is true that a *jīvaṇmukta puruṣa* does not consider himself either as a Brāhmaṇa or as a Kṣatriya ; nor does he consider himself either as rich or poor. He is devoid of these sorts of *abhimāna.* Nevertheless, he retains one *abhimāna* which he is not able to get rid of, unless his *prārabdha karmas* are fully exhausted. This is his awareness of himself as a man (*naratvābhimāna*). It is because he is a perfected human being that all the excellences of mind befitting a man are freely manifested through all his truly humanitarian activities. He, then, becomes the most benevolent saviour of the suffering humanity. This is precisely the attitude adopted by the great Swami. He has rejected the idea of the selfish salvationism and quietism and has preached again and again that the ideal of a *sannyāsin* is 'service to humanity'. He himself has said that Śaṅkara has kept his Advaita confined to those *sannyāsins* who have decided to live out of the world, i.e. in caves and mountains. The principal duty and mission of a *sannyāsin's* life is to sow the seeds of oneness of soul even in the soil of the life of the worldly people by teaching and preaching to them the secret of *karma-yoga.*

The discrepancy between knowledge and action arises only when action is not understood in its proper spirit. When action is spiritualized, it ceases to be an action in the ordinary sense and can very well be synthesized with wisdom or knowledge. Hence, in the opinion of Swami Vivekananda, one who is able to realize the *advaita-tattva*, feels an urge to make sincere endeavour, with a view to awakening that realization in others. It is only when the *sannyāsin* enters into the worldly stage, being equipped with *Brahmajñāna* and *karma sādhanā*, that he gets full scope for realizing his oneness with the whole world. When the whole world is

completely encompassed by his own being, he feels an intense urge to work for the welfare of all (just as in the bound state, one feels an intense longing for doing such actions as are conducive to one's own good). To realize the oneness of all souls through disinterested service to humanity is what Swamiji has called practical Vedānta. This practical Vedānta, indeed, is the only form in which the teachings of Śaṅkara can be moulded without contradiction, so as to become a world-religion, the saving knowledge of humanity for ages to come.

It is not possible to do full justice to the great life of Swami Vivekananda in a short article. Deeper than his genius, greater than his eloquence, even higher than his sacrifice is the character of the man, which at once excites our wonder and admiration, love and respect. That which made his character so great and noble was the belief that man was divine, and selfless service to him was the highest form of worship. To India, Swami Vivekananda has left a legacy which will sustain her for centuries.

THE CONCEPT OF HUMANITY IN INDIAN CULTURE

From the Vedic Age upto the Age of the Smṛtis and Sūtras

The subject I have chosen is a difficult one. In the first place there is no historical record of Indian thought. In the absence of thorough chronological recording of thoughts and facts of life of the ancient Indian people, it is generally difficult to trace chronologically the origin and development of any ethico-philosophical concept in India. This article covers the period from 2000 B. C. to 300 A. D.

We find that the Indians of the ancient period cared more for the truth realised : they did not attach any importance to the life and the date of the propagator of a particular form of Truth. In fact, they were more interested in enjoying the flowers and fruits of the tree of religion than in trying to find out the planters. So, the proposed attempt to trace the root of the concept of humanity in Indian culture is based mainly on the dates which have so far been collected through the strenuous efforts of several oriental scholars.

Concept of Humanity in Vedic period

The period extending from about 2000 B. C. to 600 B. C. is generally known as the Vedic period. This period is divided into three parts, namely (1) the age of the Saṁhitā : (2) the age of the Brāhmanās : (3) the age of the Upaniṣads. The age of the Saṁhitā refers to the period when the Mantras or the hymns were composed by the Ṛṣi-poet of the Vedic age. The Brāhmanās are the elaborate ritualistic treatises, whereas the Upaniṣads consist of the revelations of the mystic philosophers.

The general theory about the pre-upaniṣadic age is that this was an age when the march of mind reached merely the

plane of half-personified forces of nature together with a pantheon of Gods and Goddesses who were to be propitiated by hymns and sacrifices. The prayers that were offered unto various Gods were intended mainly for worldly things, riches, children and the like. Life in that age was simple, fresh and full of hopes and expectations and consequently the people of the Vedic age used to take pleasure in life and work. They were not at all gloomy or pessimistic. Life was a good thing to them and they were out in the world to enjoy life to its full brim. All sights and sounds of nature used to create a mysterious atmosphere for them and in this environment they used to breathe a freshness of life which inspired them to offer prayers in solicitation and admiration of various Nature Gods. In the beginning, they were more interested in the visible aspects of Nature which used to influence directly their limited pleasures and pains. So, they had a very strong desire for winning the good grace of the presiding gods of these natural phenomena and the result was an objective approach to the realm of superior values.

Although this objective outlook of the Vedic thinker could not discover the underlying unity between the cosmic principle and the individual self, still it succeeded in giving expression to an intense urge for greatness and nobility of human life which had really emerged from the depths of the evolving ideals of human perfection and human glory.

The characteristic that distinguishes man from beast is his capacity to discriminate between good and evil. It is this ethical sense and spiritual discrimination that constitutes the highest prerogative of man as the glory of humanity lies mainly in the fullest manifestation of his inner excellences (both moral and spiritual).

Man's endeavour to achieve this inner moral and spiritual growth is actually his *sādhanā* for the attainment of the ideal of humanity and such strivings and endeavours were clearly visible among the people of the Vedic age. Since the higher

God-heads were believed to be the superior powers exercising living influences on the social life of the Vedic people, the sages who were the leaders of the society had tried to disclose through their prayers not only the way of pleasing the deities but also the truth that these gods should be regarded as the manifestation of a Supreme Spirit behind and above, controlling and moving all objects and phenomena. The supreme purpose of life, therefore, ought to be to grow into higher varieties of spiritual existence. Indeed, it was the journey of the Vedic seers up the hill of their true being that had found finest expression in and through these hymns and prayers. When the Vedic sage uttered :

ṚCo A Kṣare parame vyoman
Yasmin devā adhiviśve niṣeduḥ
Yastanna vedo kimṛcā kariṣyati
ya ittadviduramṛtāste bhavanti
(Ṛgveda)

he was not making an attempt to please the supreme God or gods (who were supposed to be His various manifestations) for personal pleasures only : on the other hand, he was declaring that one should seek to know the supreme God without whose knowledge ṚK mantras would be of no use to him. To see Truth and to know Truth is the privilege of man and not of beast. Hence to attain the greatness of manhood, one should seek to enrich mind with the knowledge of the highest and the best ; because the spiritual progress is the only thing that can make him immortal. So, it can be safely suggested that the concept of manhood as the realisation of the socio-moral excellences of human life was present in a positive form even in the dim past of the Vedic age.

In fact, it is the very idea that the socio-moral good is closely connected with the spiritual good in the form of true knowledge of the Supreme Being, that has found a fine expression in the acceptance of Ṛta both as a cosmic law and a moral law in the Ṛgvedic age. Virtue and righteousness

ought to be practised by human beings as no group life or social life is possible without it. Transgressors of socio-moral rules are sinners as they work for the degradation of both human life and the life of the society. That is why, in the *yajurveda*, we find the sages offering their heartfelt prayers unto the Supreme Being in these words :

> "May the creator, the fountain of happiness and knowledge inspire us for the performance of the noblest deeds with our organs.....May a thief and a sinner be never born amongst us."
>
> —*Yajurveda—Chapter 1 No. 1*
> (*English translation by Devi Chand*)

Human aspiration to rise to the highest level of existence by getting rid of all the impurities of his soul through divine grace has repeatedly found expression through innumerable passages of the *Yajurveda* some of which are cited below :

Chapter 1 : No. 3 : "May He purify us through the store of true knowledge and all sciences contained in the Vedas elevating selfless deeds."

Chapter 1 : No. 6 : "Who prompts you to do good deeds ? It it He the Great Lord who guides us on the path of virtue. Why does He do so ? For the performance of noble virtuous deeds and fulfilment of the vow of leading a truthful life."

(*English translation by Devi Chand*)

What actually should be the connotation of nobility or virtue was of course not very analytically and scientifically considered in that age : yet the very fact, that even in that far

off age the normal and spiritual excellences of the human soul were alone regarded as the elixir of humanity, cannot be denied. It was the sincere belief of the vedic age that in order to attain the greatness of human life and purity of human existence, one ought to pay due respect to the law of righteousness which was upheld by God himself.

Even the ritualistic sacrifices were performed not for gaining purely personal benefits, but for enhancing the social good as well. There are many passages in the *yajurveda* proving conclusively that the development of the feeling of sociality was an important trait of perfect human character, Socio-ethical virtues were, in their opinion, very intimately related to spiritual perfection. Some such passages are quoted below :

Chapter I : No. 9 : "O ye men, increase the store of goods acquired by honest and fair means to be used in the service of humanity. May your life be constantly dedicated to this principle. May the spiritually-minded people also not give up this humanitarian work."

Chapter 1 : No. 11 : "I resort to agriculture and craft for removing poverty and ministering happiness to all."

Chapter 1 : No. 13 : "We should all perform agreeable *yajñas* for the attainment of God, for noble acts for the acquisition of fine virtues and for temporal and spiritual advancement. "With the aid of yajñas purify all substances and human beings. Yajñas will remove all your physical and other defects."

(*English translation by Devi Chand*)

These passages clearly prove that the sacrifices were not mere mechanical performances of the rituals of the Vedic religion. On the contrary, these were of great social, psychological and ethical values. Even when the sacrifice was accorded the supreme position, it was described as the producer of rain and the giver of spiritual knowledge, both of which were necessary for the good of the whole society. The only thing that was not clearly expounded by the seers of this age was the total merging of the perfected human soul in God in the trans-empirical state of existence. The vedic thought and discipline was otherwise primarily ethical as the moral law was admitted by the vedic sages as the law of life given by God to human beings. Hence, it can be safely suggested that one should pay due respect to the religous teachings of the Vedas as well, if one wishes to trace the origin of ethical concepts of Indian philosophy from the historical point of view.

Humanity in the Period of Upaniṣads

Coming to the age of Upaniṣads (700 B. C. to 600 B. C.) we find that the greatest contribution of this period to Indian culture is the declaration of the identity between Brahman and Ātman. The soul or the principle consciousness manifesting itself very prominently through living beings of the world is the ultimate reality and by nature it is pure and non-attached to worldly things. Due to beginningless ignorance, it forgets its own nature and gets entangled in the vortex of worldly life. Therefore, the sole purpose of the soul is to gain back its purity by removing all the impurities through ethical culture. According to the upaniṣadic thinkers, the normal excellences alone constitute the perfect personality of man and so these are very intimately connected with the spiritual realisation of an individual self. In fact, according to the Upaniṣads, there can be no true spiritualism unless it is based upon the sure foundation of morality. The perfection of manhood ts synonymous with moral acquisition and the perfection of morality culminates naturally

in spiritual realisation. It is because of this fact that the Upaniṣads have recognised clear-cut distinctions between the path of the worldly pleasures and the path of the good. The path of the good is that of morality flowering automatically into spiritual enlightenment and self-realisation. The path of the worldly pleasure leads to the fulfilment of worldly desires relating to the body only and does not render any help to a man in his self-realisation. The upaniṣadic ideal, therefore, is the moral regeneration of man accomplished through the practice of humanity – a regeneration which is the only instrument that can help him to rise above the temptation of this worldly life and enjoy the eternal bliss of his true being.

The human glory includes culture of certain socio-ethical virtues such as self-control, charity with sympathy, compassion, truthfulness, love, forgiveness, humility etc. Personal purity and nobleness of heart are to be valued by man because these are the guiding stars that lead him to final goal. Indeed, these are the qualities that have been given a very important place in the upaniṣads.

Humanity and the Common and Relative Duties of the Smṛtis, Epics and the sūtras (200 B. C. to 300 A. D.)

The varṇavibhāga or class distinction made its first appearance in the age of the Ṛg veda. It was, however, pushed back to a certain extent in the age of the upaniṣads. During the period of the smṛtis and the sūtras this system received a new orientation and through this social scheme an attempt was made to reconcile between the socio-ethical good and the spiritual good of self realisation. The main object of the division was to regard the inner self of man as the highest reality and also to realise the vastness and divinity of this self in and through socio-moral institutions. The individual was regarded merely as a functioning component of the social organisation. The main motive of each individnal soul was to realise the vastness and magnanimity of the spirit

by completely idenitifying himself with his own social group. Personal tendencies were not to be cultivated and self-assertive individuality not to be developed as all these constituted an obstacle to self-realisation which could be attained only by total effacement of the ego-sense of a person. One had to look upon oneself not as an individual A, B, or C, but always as a member of his group. Expansion of spiritual personality was the ultimate end of Indian life and the class division was the social scheme by which the interests of the individual life were wholly subordinated to the interests of society. The message of the upaniṣads that the individual souls were nothing but the sparks of One Great Soul which formed the transcendental background of this worldly life had been made the foundational principle of this social classification: consequently, the social division was not based on the base sentiments of hatred and malice, but on the noble humanitarian feeling of love and unity. In fact, Varna-Vibhāga which was nothing but a social plan of this smṛti period might be regarded as an outcome of a more developed concept of humanity. By this system individuals of various capacities could get equal opportunities to show their inherent powers in every sphere of life. This was indeed a harmony of multicoloured personalities in a social unit.

The basic principle of Indian culture is to feel intensely and to realise fully that mankind has a common heritage and a common spring of life. Humanity consists in the full development of the vision of oneness based on the finer sentiments of love, friendship and spiritual freedom. By introducing the scheme of social division the thinkers of the smṛti age gave a definite proof that Indian culture was not indifferent to social stability and social well-being. On the other hand, Varṇa-Vibhāga gave a positive outlook on social life which sought to prove that self-realisation pre-supposed a developed sense of the feelings of social unity without which the progressive realisation of the virtues and excellences of human heart was not possible. Thus, in the post-upaniṣadic period,

we find that a strong sense of positive well being of people grew side by side with a traditional ideal of liberation. Humanity, therefore, seems to mean the total renunciation of the ego-centric desires of a man in favour of higher interests of the society. It also means the cultivation of the habit of expanding one's own soul through the constant practice of socio-moral virtues. Neither happiness nor wealth should be sought for by transgressing socio-moral laws.

"Parityajet arthakamau

*

yau syatam dharmavarjitau"

was the lesson imparted to the general mass by Manu, the great law-maker of India. Manu has emphasised that it is the sacred duty of a man to adhere to all virtues belonging to his particular caste. The Rājadharma section of the Mahābhārata, too, lays great emphasis on the observance of the moral principles which constitute the very basis of higher type of society. Not only Varṇa-Dharmas but also Sādhāraṇa Dharmas should be practised vigorously since the former will be conducive to the emergence of the feeling of identity with one's own social group, whereas the cultivation of the latter will help a man to understand and realise his oneness with the whole of humanity, The very fact that the feeling of identity requires the development of an introspective attitude of mind has often been mentionend as an evidencc of the fact that Indian culture does not pay heed to social aspects of human life and teaches only to look within one's own self with a view to finding out his true nature. If we reflect on this point carefully, we shall be able to grasp the great efficacy of this method. It is because we are not used to the practice of self-analysis that we fail to realise the defects and imperfections of our own mind and easily lay blame on others. The result is constant conflict and strife between man and man, society and society, nation and nation. If we are

*Dharma—Moral Law or ten human excellences recognized by Manu.

true to ourselves we must first of all make a sincere attempt to purge our mind of all its animal legacy in the forms of anger, malice etc. This is never possible unless one looks within and finds out the cankers that hinder the unfoldment of his humanitarian qualities. Hence, introspective attitude has got to be developed if one wishes to render valuable services to society. Indeed, it is the firmly-rooted belief in India that regular practice of the moral duties in the worldly life is the thing that can promote equitable adjustment of relative demands of smaller societies in a higher ethical life of humanity.

In India, moral life has been viewed as antagonistic to natural life. According to this view, moral life involves constant struggle with the grosser aspect of a man's life which is controlled by six passions, namely, lust, anger, greed, pride, infatuation and envy. These baser feelings are required to be uprooted by constant practice of socio-moral virtues. But it may be asked how these virtues are to be cultivated. Herein comes the Gītā with its ideal of *niṣkānma karma* i.e. performance of duty from a sense of duty and divine service. According to the Gītā, every human being has his own duties to perform which he cannot neglect. Not only this, he has also to remain fully alive to the demands of his domestic, social and moral life. How to perform these duties religiously has been clearly stated in the Gītā. The Gītā advises a man that he should do his duty without any hope of reward or fear of punishment. To do good through fear only is a sign of animality : to do good from a sense of duty and service is humanity. All actions should be performed from a sacred sense of duty and not from any egoistic motive of gain, arrogance, hatred and pride. Even when the King punishes a wrong-doer. he shouid do it without hatred or malice. The effects of any action can bind the doer only when in doing that action, he has a selfish motive to realise. But if he does not seek anything for himself and performs all his actions disinterestedly, his work will not affect him in

any way. A man should, therefore, give up all his desires for selfish motives and dedicate all his actions to the Supreme Being : because then and then only he will be able to develop all human excellences in finest forms. This spirit of detachment, kept alive in the performance of daily duties in different walks of life, will help a man to reach the apex of human glory which in its turn will lead him automatically to the Highest Goal.

The attitude of vairāgya implying total renunciation of the ego-centric desires has also been described as the spirit of aparigraha. This virtue of *aparigraha* has been regarded as the basic principle of Indian ideal of humanity and spiritual culture. One who develops this noble tendency, gives up fully the spirit of selfishness with the result that he does not feel any difficulty either in giving every man what is his due or in administering justice to all in a spirit of love and service. Indeed, it is the desire for selfish gain that acts as a violent force of social disintegration and prevents men from living the life of noble and peaceful co-existence. If mankind as a whole is not in favour of giving up the sense of ego-hood and narrow individuality, then despite best efforts, human beings will not be able to reach the true ideal of humanity. That a purification of heart by the fire of knowledge of the oneness of mankind is the only means for the attainment of an integration of mankind has been repeatedly declared by the Indian preachers of humanity from the hoary vedic age upto the present age of science and scientific progress. An individual should make a sincere attempt to become a man in the true sense of the term by removing animal passions from his heart which are constantly trying to drag him down to the level of animal existence, full of strifes and struggles. In this pursuit the Gītā is a great help to the individual if he sticks to its ideal of disinterested action and courts an active life in a spirit of vairāgya and aparigraha. This attitude of detachment in active life is the only means by which a man can fight and conquer a purely natural life and fulfil his life's

mission. The spiritual culture of India teaches a man to awaken in him the spirit of humanity which enables him to ascend to a still higher stage of Divinity.

Conclusion

In fine, it can be reasonably asserted that from the very dawn of civilisation Indian people have felt and expressed a sincere desire to imbibe all excellent qualities of man. India is the only land where great importance has been attached to the purification of mind rather than to material prosperity and individual happiness. The search for truth in India primarily means a search for the moral and spiritual values of life. Such emotional feelings for higher values spring forth spontaneously from the innermost core of one's heart and flow out with such a force that it reshapes an individual in a newer and nobler form. Indian culture has never disregarded the ideal of humanity in favour of the higher transcendental ideal of self-realisation. On the other hand, it has taught the greatest truth that the ideal of self-realisation cannot be achieved unless there is socio-moral advancement. Life has to be lived by each one of us for a harmonious development of our character towards the moral ideal. And this ought to be the sense in which Indian culture should be described as spiritual. According to Indian view, moral development should be an inner growth and should spring from life and faith. In the moral sphere, a man should not move on like machine without being conscious of his moral duties and respond with animal impulses to the happenings of life without reflecting on them. He should be alert and should create himself anew in accordance with the scriptural instructions laid down for the elimination of the passions of mind. The cardinal virtues of love, sympathy, friendship and indifference should be practised by all with the force of conviction that these alone constitute the elixir of humanity. In ancient India, moral training and education through personal contact with the teacher was supposed to be the best means for self-development and self-culture as this alone

could provide a student with the opportunity of chastening his own heart and character by following the living ideal of the saintly life of his teacher. Education and not law was always accepted as the most suitable means for the building up of pure personalities and noble leaders of humanity. It was only when education had failed to keep a person on the path of duty that Indians had taken recourse to punishment and legal help. Education is indeed the training which by its own inherent force stirs up the will and sets it to fashion the individual in a finer form by awakening faith in his own self and also by making him stand on his own feet. All sense of personal advancement and the craving for egoistic satisfaction cease permanently through true education. Indeed civilisation can flourish when a world based on the humanitarian sentiments of goodwill, love and active sympathy, self-restraint and strong sense of duty comes into being. With the emergence of such a world, it is possible to preach the message of oneness of all life—a message that is bound to bring together the entire humanity after cementing the bridges of narrowness which unfortunately separate man from man.

VIVEKANANDA ON GOD

Swami Vivekananda was an advocate of *advaita-vedānta* ; he was also a devoted disciple of Shri Ramakrishna who was a worshipper of Mother Kāli. Although the philosophy of Vivekananda is essentially non-dualistic he has pleaded for devotion and divine worship by describing the Impersonal Supreme reality as God. The series of lectures on *Bhakti*, which Swamiji has delivered from time to time, shows that he never thought ill of any cult based on the fundamental duality between God and the individual soul. Like Śankara he, too, was of the opinion that all forms of divine worship could be harmonised with *advaita-vedānta* without doing any harm to its non-dualistic spirit.

Love is God

In all his lectures, Vivekananda has described God as "love" and also as the Great attractive power that lies at the very root of this universe. Love, again, has been described by him as *Sadhana* (Krishna is God and Radha is mad with love for Him). That is to say that in his opinion, God is Love and can be realised through Love. Ordinarily, these statements of Swamiji raise certain questions in our critical minds. Is Love one with the great attractive force which is governing this world of ours? Or is it the nectar that is constantly flowing down currents from the bosom of that Great power ? Who is the Great one that possesses this power ? How can love be both the end and the means for gaining the end ? One may ask : are not these statements of Swamiji regarding the nature of God confusing and contradictory ?

Now, if we go deep into the spirit of his theistic comments, we find that these contradictions are only apparent and not real. All these statements can be knitted together in a logical manner to build up the theistic philosophy of Swami Vivekananda. Swamiji realised the necessity of harmonising the

warm yearnings of the human heart with the cold criticisms of Reason. So he has not only advocated the existence of *saccidananda* as the ultimate category, but has also described the Supreme being as Love. It is only when God is regarded as Love that man can find full satisfaction of his emotional nature by seeking shelter in Him. Love is what a human heart always craves for. If love does not find any place in a religious system then that system ceases to be religious in the true sense of the term. In the Gita, Lord Krishna says that he is the knowledge of the knowers. *(Jñānam jñānavatamaham)* Swamiji says that God is the very love of the lovers. Love is the noblest and finest flowering of the emotional life of a person and as such it is to be regarded as the manifestation of the immortal juice in the very being of a finite personality. Just as God is both knowledge and attainable through knowledge, in the same manner He is both Love and attainable through Love.

Love as Means

It is because God is Love and is present in all beings and things of the world as their essence and excellence that love also serves as the principal means for attaining communion with God. Love in the form of Divinity constitutes the innermost core of an individual soul. In the words of Katha Upaniṣad, it is "*Guḍamanupraviṣṭam*". Though it is present in the soul, yet due to ignorance and impurities of this worldly life, this divinity remains concealed and unrealised. The form in which Love ordinarily finds expression in worldly life is tainted and made narrow by the soiling touch of egoism and selfish individuality. The result is that we cannot love anybody disinterestedly (i. e. for love's sake only). Hence, love in worldly life appears in the forms of selfishness, lust, greed etc. and prevents us from attaining the highest ideal of life. (Even this selfishness is but a manifestation of the same love). If Love is to be purified, then constant practice of virtues in the forms of charity with sympathy, compassion, forgiveness, humility, love etc. becomes absolutely necessary

for a devoted soul. All these virtues are nothing but expressions of Love in different forms. Hence, to practise these virtues in all types of social relation is equivalent to adopting love as a means to God-realization. Purity and nobleness of heart are to be valued by man because these are the guiding stars to lead him to his final goal : such purity cannot be attained unless the heart of man is flooded with Love by constant culture of it in a disinterested manner in all walks of his worldly life. The conception of God as Love can remain fixed in the mind of the devotee only through its ceaseless display in all worldly affairs. The whole of the world constitutes a single family of which God is the Father. So, all members should be connected together by the ties of friendship and love. It is only by loving the finite in a disinterested manner (considering it as a manifestation of God) that the *mumuksu* can become mad with love and longing for God. It would, therefore appear that there is no contradiction if one says that God is Love and is also attainable through love. It is the nature of love to change a man into that which he loves. If a man loves the Great Love, he himself changes into that form and becomes one with the Life Divine. In fact, the love that we display in our day-to-day dealings is nothing but an expression of that Great Love which remains covered by the dust of impurities issuing forth from various *antaḥkaraṇikā vṛttis*.

God is both Love and the Great Attractive Power of the Universe

There is also no inconsistency in describing God both as Love and as the great attractive power of the Universe. If God as Love is the cause of the whole universe, then it is only logical that He should also be regarded as the great attractive power of the world. That which is Love, naturally draws everything towards it. Moreover, *jagatkāraṇatā* itself is power or 'Śakti' and hence God as Love and as the root cause of the universe is bound to be an attractive power behind and beyond

this world of created existence. He is the force which regulates the course of the sun and the moon. He is the reality that constitutes the very being of all created things of the universe and it is He who is expressing Himself in the world in the forms of various natural laws. "Unattached yet shining in every thing is love, the motive power of the universe without which the universe would fall to pieces in a moment, and this love is God." The Highest Being is described in the Bṛhad Upaniṣad as fearless (*abhayam vai janaka prāptosi*). It is only Love that is fearless and any body who tastes love becomes fearless. The mother does not hesitate to stand face to face with death when she realises that by doing so she can save the life of her dear son. A devoted wife is not afraid of risking her own precious life for the sake of her beloved husband. The Ultimate Reality as described in the Upaniṣad is *abhiḥ* and Love too is *abhiḥ*. We find that Swamiji has not said anything against Vedānta teachings by describing the Highest Being as Love. Since this Great Love is the source of everything it is also the source of all forms of finite love which we enjoy in and through our worldly relations. Infinite love produces finite love just as Infinite knowledge produces finite phenomenal knowledge. Hence, God is both Love and a fountain of Love from which streams of sympathy, affection, compassion etc. are flowing downwards to feed the hearts of human beings. There is no vagueness in describing God both as Love and as the possessor of Love as the *advaita-vedānta* recognises *tādātmya* and not *bheda* between power and the possessor of power.

Considering from all points of view, we can say the statements of Vivekananda regarding the nature of God signify only the truth that God is Love.

In *Pañcadaśi*, God has been described as *ānandamaya* and it has been stated that being bliss, God is also the object of love (*Yaḥ paramānandarupo na bhavati sa niratiśaya premaviṣaya na bhavati*). In fact the two statements "God is bliss" and "God is love" convey the same truth. Although,

ordinarily we think that love issues forth from *Ananda* as an effect, still from the philosophical point of view, these two terms can be used to signify the same truth. It is *Ananda* that finds expression in and through love. Bliss, indeed, is the inner aspect and Love is the outer expression of the Supreme being. God dwells in the heart of man as bliss and when this bliss is expressed in the external world, it assumes the form of love and devotion. Hence, there is no cause-effect relationship between bliss and love.

God as Love and Practical Advaita

This conception of God as Love is the keynote of Swami Vivekananda's practical *advaita*. Although Swamiji is a staunch follower of *advaita-vedānta*, still the view of the *advaitins* that knowledge and action cannot meet together has not found favour with him. On the other hand, Swamiji has taught us that action understood in its proper spirit can be synthesised effectively with knowledge. The secret of *karmayoga* is nothing but spiritualisation of service by cultivating the attitude of selfless love and devotion to Life Divine. The pursuit of *karmayoga* lies in making action free of all selfish interests and also in shifting the motive from narrow egoism to the infinite love and bliss that supports the whole world. The Great Love is manifesting itself in and through this colourful multiplicity which we call "world". It is therefore, the duty of a devotee to love and adore this finitized expression of the Infinite and also to serve God by serving His innumerable children. He should see God in every creature and all his activities should take the form of an offering of pure Love to God without selfish motive. He loves God because he cannot help loving God who Himself is Love : he serves God by serving the whole of His creation in a disinterested manner because his love must find an outlet in service. In the sphere of religion *upāsya* and *upāsaka* are mutually drawn to each other by intrinsic excellences and not by desire to secure any selfish end. Giving up of the sense of egohood (which constitutes the real bondage of the soul) is easily achieved only in

the sphere of Pure Love. Mother can easily forget all personal comforts and gains for the sake of her children. It is also easy for man to love that being who himself is a fountain of love. True service is possible only through love and true service also constitutes the test of pure love. When action is performed in the attitude of devotion and selfless love for the whole universe, it assumes the form of spiritual *Sadhana* which is wholly beneficial to the highest goal of human life. It is only through selfless love that one can feel his identity with the whole of creation and can easily engage himself in such philanthropic works which are sure to bring good to mankind. Swamiji has said that selfish man is the most miserable creature in this world. One who is selfless is happy. He feels his identity with the whole universe and God dwells in the heart of such a true lover. A man is always eager to give up everything for a person whom he loves and he and his loved one are not two but one. The narrow individuality which divides man from man is not his real being. The true being of man is the divinity that resides in him as his permanent support. This divinity is expressing itself through all sights and sounds of the universe. Hence, nobody is a stranger ; all are members of one Divine Family. Swamiji has said, "The perfect man sees nothing but God". "He expands into one mass of universal love, infinite love—the love that is God".

Summing Up

Truly speaking, God of Vivekananda's philosophy is no other than the Impersonal Brahman that has been described as *saccidananda* in the philosophy of the advaita school. Swamiji has said, "One infinite soul is manifesting itself in multiple forms through multiple mirrors. This infinite soul constituting the background of the universe is no other than God." Like Śaṁkara, Vivekananda, too, has not accepted devotion to *Saguna Brahman* as a direct means to liberation. According to him, ascription of personality to One Impersonal Reality and devotion to such at personal God takes place in the lowest

stage of spiritual sadhana when God, Nature and Soul are regarded as essentially distinct and different.

"We have seen that there is the eternal God and there is eternal Nature and there is also an infinite number of eternal souls. This is the first stage in religion, it is called dualism... when man looks at Nature, he is the subject and Nature is the object. When he looks at God, he sees God as the subject and himself as the object."

Next stage, according to Swamiji, is the stage of *viśiṣṭādvaita* when man feels that he is a spark of that Great fire and that the whole universe is a manifestation of God Himself. "We are little particles floating in one mass and that mass is God. We are individuals but one in God. We are all in Him. We are all parts of Him and therefore we are one. And yet between man and man, man and God, there is strict individuality, separate and yet not separate."

The highest stage is the *advaita* stage when one realises that the Infinite eternal reality cannot really be made finite. It is always infinite and the finite forms are nothing but the different reflections of that One Impersonal Being in different fictitious *buddhis*. This being may be called God even in the impersonal form simply because of the fact that it constitutes foundational principle of the universe. This Infinite is, however, not God in the sense of a personal being that remains essentially distinct and different from the indivl-dual soul.

The salient feature of Swamiji's theistic teaching is that he has lucidly shown how a man can worship God even in the *advaita* stage—a point that has not been dealt with clearly and consistently in the philosophy of Śaṁkara. According to Swamiji, worship of God in the advaita stage means simply devotion to and love for *Saccidananda* Brahman that constitutes one's own real self. Even though there is *Upāsya* it is no other than his own self. To worship one's own self is very natural to human beings. Even in the stage of bondage, an individual thinks only of the good of his own self and performs various

actions only with a view to satisfying his own self. In other words, a man, engrossed in worldly enjoyments, worships nothing but his own self. According to Swamiji, in the highest stage of realisation also, man worships nothing but his own self : but the concept of self is different in these two stages. In worldly stage, the self that is worshipped is narrow, impure and false, whereas in the stage of liberation, one worships one's own true self which is both *Bhūmā* and *ānanda*. Swamiji thus has given reply to the age-old criticism against *advaita-vedanta* that by falsifying God, advaita has done away with the necessity of worship in the stage of *tattva jñana*. Moreover, the vaiṣṇava religion describes *Bhakti* as a form of love for God who himself is a fountain of love, whereas *advaita* does not provide any such scope for *premalakṣaṇā bhakti* which has become a discouraging aspect of advaita-vedanta according to some critics. Swamiji has solved this difficulty by describing *saccidananda* as love—a conception which is very dear to the loving heart of a devotee. Man is essentially a unity of intellect, emotion and conation and it is only through the satisfaction of these three aspects of his nature that he can be fully satisfied. Intellect awakens in him an intense desire for the knowledge of the ultimate uniting principle, whereas emotion inspires him to cling to some such being from whom he will be able to receive love. Conation again seeks its expression through different forms of enterprise. By defining the highest being as impersonal absolute and also as love and by synthesising advaita knowledge with *niṣkāma karma*, Swamiji has brought about a happy reconciliation between knowledge, action and devotion. Of course, *Pañcadaśī* has given a high place to love by describing Brahman as the object of love (*Prītiviṣayatvāt ānandasvarūpatā*). Even then *Pañcadaṣī* has not described *saccidananda* as Love. If we follow the teachings of *Pañcadaśī* closely and carefully, we find that according to this advaita text, love refers to that *vṛtti* only which has bliss for its object. So, here love is only a means to the realisation of bliss but it is not bliss itself. If love is only a

vṛtti having *ananda* as its object, than in the highest stage of liberation, it will naturally find no place due to the destruction of all *vṛttis*. Such a state, too, is not wholly pleasing to God-intoxicated soul who seeks nothing but divine love.

The writings of Swami Vivekananda reveal that he has not accepted love simply as a *vṛtti* having its object in the form of bliss ; on the other hand, it is the *vṛttyavacchinna caitanya* that has actually been admitted as Love by him. In fact, it is consciousness that is primary ; whereas *vṛtti* is only secondary. If this consciousness and not the *vṛtti* is regarded as love, then this love can exist even in the highest stage as *saccidananda Brahman* and so Brahman itself can be legitimately described as Love.

The greatness of Vivekananda lies in the fact that he has interpreted the ascetic *advaita vāda* of Śaṁkara in such a charming manner that it has become saturated through and through with love. It has thus become a source of inspiration for those who wish to take shelter in Love and Love only.

ISVARAKRISNA AND VIJNANABHIKSU ON RELATION BETWEEN THE WORLD AND THE WORLD-CAUSE

The world that we see, feel and touch is a fact of experience, but not its cause. As a fact of experience the world is present before us and no sane man can deny its empirical reality. We perceive constantly that every event of this world points to some other event as its necessary pre-condition. The iron chain of causal necessity, perceptible in this world, naturally leads us to think of the world as an effect of some ultimate cause. So, it is both logical and natural for us to ask : what then is the ultimate cause of the world ? An enquiry into the nature of the ultimate cause from which the world has come as an effect, has, therefore, become a major problem for discussion in philosophical systems of India.

Relation of Tādātmya between Nature and the World

According to Vijñāna Bhikṣu, the modifiable cause of the world is *prakṛti*. *Prakṛti*, constituted of the three *guṇas*, is real and eternal and is also an essentially dynamic principle. It is the only modifiable substance and all phenomena constituting the world are nothing but so many states of *prakṛti* which are potentially present in the causal substance even before their actual manifestation. Matter and energy which exist in a particular causal form changes into the appropriate effect-form as soon as the barrier preventing its manifestation is removed. The temporal distinctions between the past, present and future states of the effect are possible only on the assumption of the prior existence of the effect in the causal substance, in the form of matter and energy.[1]

(1) Sāṁkhya-pravacana-bhāṣya, Chap. I. Commentary on Sūtra, 116.

In our day-to-day life when we perceive that a jar comes into being from a lump of clay, what actully happens at that moment is this : the clay form of the matter and energy becomes implicit and the potentiality of becoming transformed into the jar-form is expressed in its place. The effect is only the cause transformed and modified in a new fashion. Since the effect emerges from the energy of the cause, it is of the same substance. The effect pre-exists in the cause and is also a real transformation of the cause.

This theory of causation is termed as *satkārya-vāda* and *pariṇāma-vāda* which seeks to explain fully the transformation of one causal substance (i. e. *prakṛti*) in the form of this diversified world. One world-cause is becoming many because it includes within itself potentiality for diversification. It is because of the fact that in an act of production, one causal substance is undergoing transformation from one state to another, that there is the relation of *tādātmya* (identity) between the cause and the effect, from the point of view of *upādāna* (material cause). This *tādātmya* alone serves as the basis for establishing the existence of *prakṛti* as the material cause of the world on the perception of the facts and phenomena of the world.[1]

That there is *tādātmya* between nature and the world has been admitted in his *Sāṁkhya-kārikā* by Īśvarakṛṣṇa as well. In *kāṛikā* 8, it has been clearly stated that the intellect and the rest are both like and unlike *prakṛti*, (*prakṛti svarūpaṁ virūpaṁ ca*). In other words, the effect is identical with the cause in respect of the *upādāna* whereas in respect of the form, the effect is different from the cause. Again, commenting the *kārikā* 9, Vācaspati has said that there is non-difference between cloth (effect) and yarns (cause) because there is no conjunction between them and because there is no separation between them. Further, the cloth and the yarns are not different things because the cloth does not contain in itself anything else which makes its weight

(1) Sāṁkhya-pravacana-bhāsya, Chap. I, Commentary on Sūtra, 110.

different from the weight of the yarns constituting it. This is because an object differing in essence from another object has a weight different from that of the latter.

Relation of Avibhāga Between God and Nature

From the above discussion, it is clear that both Bhikṣu and Īśvarakṛṣṇa have admitted *tādātmya* between *prakṛti* (*upādāna*) and the world (*upādeya*). Bhikṣu has gone further to assert that although *prakṛti* possesses dynamism by its own nature, still God is to be regarded as the controller of Nature as otherwise the unconscious dynamism of Nature cannot be controlled and channelised in a proper manner. Hence, in his opinion, there is *upādāna-upādeya* relation between Nature and the world, but there is *adhiṣṭhāna-adhiṣṭheya* (substratum-supported) relation between God and nature. God being the substratum of *prakṛti*, is also the substratum (*adhiṣṭhāna-karaṇa*) of the world. Now, the relation that exists between *adhiṣṭhāna* and *adhiṣṭheya* is *avibhāga* and not *tādātmya*. The distinction between *avibhāga* and *tādatmya* lies in the fact that the former exists even in the stage of dissolution whereas the latter exists only when causes and effects are explicitly manifested and strictly determined.

Īśvarakṛṣṇa has not admitted God as the ultimate ground of the whole of creation and so he has no need to introduce any discussion on the nature of the relation that can be logically supposed to exist between *prakṛti* and its substratum in the form of God. Nevertheless, if we carefully go through the *Sāṃkhya-kārikā*, we will find that Īśvarakṛṣṇa has not mentioned explicitly and definitely that *puruṣa* is the *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa* of *prakṛti*. On the other hand he has faintly suggested that there is a sort of *nitya-saṁyoga* (eternal contact) between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* and this fact has been virtually accepted by him. The argument about *ādhiṣṭhāna* mentioned in *Kārikā* 17 seeks to prove that *puruṣa* is intelligising *prakṛti* by its mere *sannidhi* (proximity) so as to make it fit for the creation of this world. *Puruṣa* is not an

agent : it is the principle of consciousness that vitalizes *prakṛti* by its mere presence (*sattā*). Bhikṣu has defined *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇa* as that, which by remaining inseparably related to the real and changeable material cause prompts the latter to create the cosmic order. In the light of this definition given in the *Vijñāñāmṛtā-bhāṣya,* we can say that *puruṣa* of *Sāṁkhya-kārikā* may also be regarded as the substratum of *prakṛti,* because the all-pervading *prakṛti* is eternally related to the all-pervading *puruṣa* which, by means of reflection, transforms *prakṛti* into an intelligised Nature and gives it meaning and value as the potential energy of the universe. In *Sāṁkhya-kārikā,* both *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* have been defined as all-pervading.

hetumat, anityam, avyāpi sakriyam,
anekam, āśritaṁ, lingaṁ
sāvayayaṁ, paratantraṁ vyaktaṁ,
viparitam avyaktam,
triguṇaṁ avivekī, viṣayaḥ,
sāmānyam, acetanaṁ, prasavadharmi
vyaktaṁ, tatha pradhānaṁ,
tadviparītastatha puman No. 11

The last line of the verse 11 means that *puruṣa* is reverse in all characteristics mentioned in the said *Kārikā,* but is similar to *prakṛti* in the characteristics mentioned in verse 10 i. e. *puruṣa* is *ahetumat* (uncaused), *nitya* (eternal), *vyāpi* (all pervading) etc. If both *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* are all-pervading principles, there is sure to be some relation of a general form between them. In other words, both *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* are inseparably related from beginningless time (being all-pervading in nature) and this '*nitya saṁyoga*' between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* may legitimately be described as a form of *avibhāga* in the *kārikā Saṁkhya* as well. While Bhikṣu has ascribed the power of vitalising *prakṛti* to God the author of *Sāṁkhya-kārikā* has assigned this task to *puruṣa.* Otherwise, like the *puruṣa* of *Sāṁkhya-kārikā,* Bhikṣu's God, too, is *nirguṇa* and *niṣkriya,* all activities being

due to *prakṛti* which is an adjunct (*upādhi*) of *Brahman*. Both God and *puruṣa* are only the witnessing consciousness (*Sakṣi*) and being the vitalising principles of *prakṛti*, they are regarded as the *adhiṣṭhāna* of *prakṛti*. Although Iśvarakṛṣṇa has not described *prakṛti*, as the *upādhi* of *puruṣa*, yet the *Sāṁkhya-kārikā* provides us with legitimate grounds for regarding *prakṛti* as an adjunct of *puruṣa*. It is due to the reflection of consciousness in *prakṛti* that there is an intimate connection between the two. In the reflected consciousness are falsely revealed (as non-different) all natural changes due to ignorance (*upasamīpavartini ādadhāti svakīyaṁ rūpamiti upādhi*). Considered from this point of view, *prakṛti* of *Sāṁkhyā-kārikā* can very well be regarded as an *upādhi* of *puruṣa*.

Conclusion

Truly speaking, the differences that we notice in the writings of Bhiksu and Iśvarakṛṣṇa so far as Sāṁkhya-philosophy is concerned, are mainly due to the fact that while Iśvarakṛṣṇa is a thorough-going dualist, Bhikṣu is not. Bhikṣu is a supporter of *Nirguṇa Brahmavāda* and has, therefore, tried to formulate his philosophy in a manner that will make provision for *prakṛti*, *puruṣa*, *Īśvara* and also *Nirguṇa Brahman*. That an unconscious dynamic force cannot by itself create the universe has been accepted by both the philosophers. While Bhikṣu has introduced God in the form of an *adhyakṣa* (to serve the purpose of uniting *puruṣa* with Nature) Iśvarakṛṣṇa has mentioned the relation of *cit* with *prakṛti* as being the cause of creation (*saṁyogāḥ tat kṛtaḥ sargaḥ*). It seems to us that the author of *Sāṁkhya-kārikā* has not described *puruṣa* as the *adhiṣṭhāna-kāraṇā* of *prakṛti* or *prakṛti* as the limiting adjunct of *puruṣa* due to the fact that an explicit statement in either direction will impair the independence of *prakṛti* and will consequently be detrimental to his original dualistic position ; otherwise, there is ample scope for bringing *kārikā-sāṁkhya* very close to the theistic *Sāṁkhya* of Vijñānabhikṣu. In order to keep intact the

freedom and independence of *prakṛti*, the author of *Sāṁkhya-kārikā* has used the word '*sannidhi*' and not the word '*adhyakṣa.*' In the opinion of Iśvarakṛṣṇa, creation is beginningless and the relation between *puruṣa and prakṛti* which is the cause of creation is also beginningless (as both spirit and matter are all-pervading). Hence, it is a mere folly to make an attempt to find out the cause of that which is beginningless. There is, therefore, no need for postulating God.

Vijñābhiksu, on the other hand, has tried to reconcile his interpretation of the Saṁkhya with the views of the Purāṇas and the Upaniṣads where God has been described as the Ground of all things and beings of the world. Hence in his writings, God has appeared in the form of a mover whose main task is to dissociate and associate *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*—the two constitutive principles of the world.

There are two forms of Supreme Reality—Brahman and Iśvara. Brahman is Pure Consciousness and unchangeable. God possesses energies constituting *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* whose association and dis-association are due to His operation. Brahman in its real from, is Pure Consciousness whereas in association with its limiting condition in the form of *prakṛti*, the supreme principle assumes the role of a Creator, Preserver and Destroyer of the world. Brahman and Iśvara do not belong to two different levels of reality. Both are equally real. Thus the Sāṁkhya philosophy which Bhikṣu has formulated has assumed the form of a theistic Sāṁkhya with a tendency towards Nirguṇa Brahmavāda. This has distinguished it from the so-called theistic Sāṁkhya or the Yoga system. This is also the point of distinction between the kārikā-sāṁkhya and the sāṁkhya-philosophy of Vijñānabhiksu.

PART II

PHILOSOPHY OF SAMKHYA : ITS VALUE IN THE PRESENT AGE

"Whenever a process of thinking seeks to discover all effects including the final one of any object or action, it is to be treated as philosophical in nature". Such thinking enables a man to work with full knowledge and consequently he is capable of producing beneficial results in the social and cultural life. On the other hand, if a man takes into consideration only the immediate and apparently useful effects of an action and fails to visualise its final consequences, he is sure to suffer in the end.

Nobody can, therefore avoid, being a philosopher in his thought and deed, if he wishes to attain success in his mundane existence. It is therefore wrong to think that philosophy does not exert influence on the practical life of a human being. As a matter of fact, the approach of Indian philosophy is essentially moral and practical : as such the promotion of social welfare and good of the mundane life does come within the purview of the philosophical teachings of ancient India. Unless there is a peaceful social environment, there cannot be any successful endeavour to attain spiritual perfection. Both material prosperity and spiritual perfection pre-suppose a society in which there is law and order ensuring the possibility of an undisturbed pursuit of one's own mission of life. It is only a good social life that provides a man with a peaceful atmosphere in the midst of which he can practise his own course of spiritual discepline-

Samkhya philosophy

The philosophy of samkhya believes in the reality of the worldly life and lays emphasis on the dignity of man and also on the significance and value of social life. This philosophical system is interested in the wordly-life and also in the social relations of human beings. The world is a necessary stage ; it is also of supreme moral and sociological significance for man to

work for the benefit of the world through the functioning of a pure will which is wholly free from passions and prejudices of the mind. The admission of the reality of the world and its objects which are of daily use in the life of a worldly-man brings the philosophy of the samkhya school close to the heart of the ordinary people who are not willing to accept the view of the falsity of the world and the wordly life. Life of a man begins in a material world which feeds him, nourishes him and provides him with all the material comforts of life. How can such a world be false and fictitious ? The soul itself remains wrapped up in a material covering—a covering to which we have got to give such importance as is its legitimate due. The natural life is not to be ignored. It is to be harmonised with the spiritual life through the cultivation of humanitarian values. It is not necessary for us to give up the legitimate pleasures of the natural life but these pleasures should be brought in tune with the spiritual prefection which is the final goal of a human being.

Enjoyment with spirit of Selflessness

The natural or the worldly life of a man is harmonised with spiritual perfection only when the enjoyment is coupled with the spirit of self-sacrifice. This type of enjoyment has been really advocated by the samkhya philosophy. According to samkhya, the worldly life is to be grounded on truth, sacrifice, restraint and non-violence which issue forth from the cultivation of sāttvika or the nobler aspect of the mind. These excellences should constitute the foundation- stone of the human life, because these values are closely inter-linked with the peace and progress of man in all spheres of his existence. Happiness or contentment necessarily accompanies only a selfless life. So, the highest type of enjoyment is always linked with the spirit of sacrifice. If enjoyment is sought for the sake of selfish satisfaction only, then such enjoyment will produce nothing but ignorance, greed, hatred etc. which act as pain-producing facts in the life of an individual as well as of society.

The samkhya philosophers have always advised people to effect a happy union between bhoga and tyaga (i. e. enjoyment

and renunciation of selfish motive), by increasing sattvaguna and a consequent subjugation of rajo aud tamogunas. Apart from what saṁkhya philosophers have said in the past, it is admitted even today that the cultivation of virtues like love, truth, sacrifice, selflessness etc. in all human dealings, is essential because without them no human society can survive for long.

Struggle against error and evil

According to the philosophy of saṁkhya, both good and evil are the necessary outcome of evolution of Nature on the psychical plane : because the buddhi or the intellect possesses knowledge and ignorance, detachment and attachment, virtue and vice etc. as its inherent dispositions. The stream of mind flows towards good : it also flows towards evil. Truly speaking, natural (prakritika) evolution is a struggle against and a conquest of error in the sphere of knowledge and of evil in the sphere of morality. The worldly life of a man is a life of constant struggle against evil so as to be able to reach the realm of truth and good. A man should not, therefore, be unhappy over his struggling existence. He should not make any attempt to escape from the battle of life. Just as happiness is real, in the same manner, sorrow too, is real; if we want to hide ourselves behind a covering shell so as not to be exposed to pain and misery, then we knew only an artificial world—a world of our own making. The real world—the throbbing and palpitating natural refuge of living beings—will then elude our grasp. Thus, according to samkhya, it is the duty of man to face boldly the worldly-life with all its tears and smiles. We should not hesitate to invite sorrow just as we never hesitate to invite pleasures. We should realise that misery is also an aspect of our natural life. Worldly life should be embraced in its richness as well as in its poverty. It is only by doing so that we shall be able to find out the truth of life which is peace beyond the natural struggle of the psycho-physical existence. Liberation is the outcome of experiences—both painful and pleasurable. It we wish to be liberated, first of all, we must encounter bravely life in all its aspects. The samkhya philosophy teaches that liberation is the final fulfilment

of the course of evolution of the living and vibrating Nature. According to classical samkhya, there is no God but the purified puruṣa. It is explained that the purified puruṣa is the puruṣa that has gone through the flames of his psycho-physical life and has come out as one who is stripped of all the impurities of a natural life. Obviously, such a philosophy gives enough courage and hope to stand the trials of life without fear and tears. To be liberated, we are not to go out of the world : we are to free ourselves from the painful and suffering grip of the world by living through its complications. We are to transcend Nature with the help of Nature. There is perhaps no other way.

Buddhi : Its place of honour

The samkhya philosophy has assigned a high place to buddhi, (Buddhi), is impregnated with those capacities that are necessary for the physical, moral and spiritual development of man. It is through the cultivation of the good dispositions of the intellect that a man can acquire a noble personality. So, according to samkhya, an effective culture of the beneficial powers of the intellect should form the keynote of the personality-development of man. The ultimate goal of life is no doubt attainment of peace : but peace can only be attained when an individual has acquired human excellences by the purification of his intellect and the mind. According to the samkhya, buddhi is the principle that produces both cognition and feelings as a result of which the feeling-aspect of experience often remains indistinguishable from the cognitive aspect. Therefore, the man who seeks to develop his buddhi, feeds both his head and heart and becomes a man in the true sense of the term. Intellectual greatness necessarily implies nobleness of the heart and these two together are alone capable of raising a man from a lower level of existence to a higher one. Man can elevate and uplift himself by cultivating the higher dispositions of the buddhi, thereby making his thought, feeling and deed pure and noble. It is the cultivation of the sattvika bhavana (i. e. the noble qualities of the heart and higher capacities of the

intellect) that changes an animal-man to a true man of a balanced and peaceful nature. Such a personality alone is in a position to do good to mankind as well as to the world as a whole.

Conclusion

Truly speaking, human glory does not lie in the culture of reason alone. The process of man-making really consists in the harmonious development of reason, will and emotion. This is a process which involves a continuous unfoldment of all moral excellences of a man's character along with the cultivation of higher powers of thought. The philosophy of samkhya which lays emphasis on such a process of 'soul-making' or 'man-making' provides us with a spiritualism which is the final offshoot of a developed humanism. The modern man can join hands with the philosophy of this school in so far as it believes in the transformation of the natural life of man to the pure life of sattvaguṇa when human excellences bloom forth in their bright radiance and glory. No 'ism' of the modern era can be of any service to man unless it is rooted in a "humanitarian philosophy". Humanity consists in the full development of the vision of unity based on the finer sentiments of love, friendship and freedom : it is the development of such a vision by every seeker of truth and goodness that is emphasised upon by the philosophy of the samkhya school. Indeed, the realistic samkhya upholds a standard of humanity in thought and action which can be effectively followed even in the modern age.

LOGIC IN THE SAMKHYA SCHOOL

Etymologically, logic means the science of knowledge and as such there is no fundamental difference between Epistemology and Logic. Epistemology is a more general study of knowledge than Logic. Generally, sources of knowledge, analysis of their processes with a view to bringing out their features which ensure validity, false knowledge etc. are some of the topics which are studied in details in Logic. Hence, the topics which will be dealt with in the Logic of the Sāṁkhya School are as under :—

(i) Sources of knowledge,
(ii) Perception and its analysis,
(iii) Inference and its analysis,
(iv) Verbal testimony,
(v) Other sources of knowledge.

Here, we should remember that the problems dealt with in Indian Logic are psychological, epistemological, metaphysical and not purely logical. Each school has its own logical standpoint determined by its general philosophical outlook.

Perception : Perceptual knowledge is definite cognition (adhyavasaya) that results from the sannikarsa (relation) between an object and a particular sense-organ. External perception of an external object is caused by the combined operation of the external sense-organ and internal organs whereas internal perception of pleasures, pains etc. is caused only by the operation of the internal organs.

Analysis of the Perceptual Process

The factors involved in the perceptual knowledge are :

(i) The object (prameya) with which the sense-organ comes in contact

(ii) Pratyakṣa pramāṇa or the vṛtti of the intellect (buddhi vṛtti) caused by the relation between the object and the sense-organ.

(iii) Pramātā or the knower.

(iv) Pratyakṣa pramā or the reflection of puruṣa in the pratyakṣa vṛtti.

Indeterminate and Determinate Perception

Division of perception into indeterminate and determinate forms is a characteristic of Indian systems of philosophy. Different systems have, however, held different views regarding this distinction. According to Saṁkhya, the external sense-organs receive only indeterminate impressions from their specific objects. Knowledge of a qualified object cannot be gained by the external sense-organs. Sāṁkhya Karika has described the indeterminate awareness as alocana mātram jnānam. This simple and indeterminate awareness begins to change into the form of a determinate and qualified knowledge when the mind comes into operation. Both discrimination and assimilation which are involved in determinate perception, are the functions of the mind. After mind, the ego-sense comes into operation and lastly, there is the operation of the intellect resulting in the formation of determinate knowledge proper which is called adhyavasāya. Adhyavasāya is a disposition of the intellect which is the substratum of all forms of vrttijnāna.

Sannikarṣa

It is true that in the available Sāṁkhya texts, there is no mention of sannikarṣa. Even then as the Sāṁkhya has defined perceptual knowledge as definite cognition received through the contact of the sense organ with the object, sannikarsa, in diffefferent forms may be justified from the Saṁkhya point of view as well . Classification of sannikarṣas, may be done following the line of the advaita vedanta.

(i) Samyoga to perceive substances.

(ii) Samyukta tādātmya to perceive quality of a substance.

(iii) Samyukta-tadātma-tādatmya to perceive the universal of the quality of a substance.

(iv) Tādātmya to perceve pleasures, pains etc. through buddhivrtti. This can be operative in the perception of sound

also which is in tādātmya relation with the ether. The organ of hearing is pervaded by ether.

Illusion

The illusory perception too poses no difficulty. Take the case of the conch-shell-silver illusion (idam rajatam). The perception of idam is the perception of sadvastu. The idamvṛtti arises as a result of contact between the sense-organ and the 'idam'. So far as rajatākāra vṛtti is concerned, it arises in the intellect as a result of the combined operation of the awakened rajata-vāsāna and non-discrimination of rajata and śukti. Although idamvṛtti and rajatavṛtti are different still due to reflection of one and the same consciousness through two vṛttis, knowledge arises as one.

Inference

Inferential knowledge is that knowledge in which the modification of the intellect in the form of the inferred object, occurs in the absence of the contact between the external sense-organ and the object. Inference is based on

(i) Knowledge of the hetu as invariably and unconditionally related to the sadhya.

(ii) Knowledge of the presence of the hetu as a dharma of the pakṣa.

Inferential Process Analysed

In arriving at the inferential knowledge 'parvatovahnimān', there is firstly the perception of the hetu (smoke) in the pakṣa (hill). Secondly, there is the remembering of vyapti in the form 'where there is smoke, there is fire'. Vṛtti of the hill with smoke is aparokṣa (immediate) whereas vṛtti in the form of fire is parokṣa (mediate). It is because the same consciousness is reflected through both the vṛttis, that there is knowledge of fire in the hill.

Kinds of Inference

Inference is of two kinds :

(i) Vitam (viśeṣeṇa itam = jñānam)

(ii) Avitam.

In the first form, vyāpti is arrived at by perceiving the universal co-presence of the hetu and the sadhya.

The second form is based on the Kevala vyatireki vyāpti.

Methods of Arriving of Vyāpti

Vypāti can be obtained

(i) By perceiving mainly anvayadṛṣṭāntas

(ii) By perceiving both anvayadṛṣṭāntas and vyatireka dṛṣṭantas.

(iii) By perceiving only vyatirekadṛṣṭantas.

Śabda

Āptavacana refers to vedic teachings only which are not the results of the efforts of erring human beings. Kapila simply remembered what he had learnt from the vedas in his past lives and so the Saṁkhya ideas (which were not innovated by him) are indubitable.

So far as other sources of knowledge are concerned, they are not accorded any independent status in the philosophy of the Samkhya School.

METAPHYSICS IN THE SAMKHYA

The Theory of the Guṇas

As a metaphysical study, the Samkhya also seeks to know the real truths which underlie human experience. The Guṇa theory which is the distinctive feature of the Sāṁkhya metaphysics is not established dogmatically. It is the outcome of a rational and critical analysis of human experience.

All objects of the worid, whether simple or complex, have in them pure being or sattā (existence) as their ultimate basis and essential stuff. This existence (sātta) constitutes the intelligibility of an object. Only an existent object can be related to knowledge and can become intelligible to us. A sky-flower, for example, being devoid of sattā, can never be intelligible to any body. Each fact of experience is a being or sattā and this being or existence is the ultimate factor in an object of experience. It is called sattva guṇa by the Saṁkhya philosophers.

The object of experience also possesses certain characteristics like resistance, impenetrability, shape and form, which are, in fact, due to the presence of massiveness in objects. It is because an object is massive in nature that it can assume shape and can also resist its complete destruction through change, allowing only the change of form. Mass or tamoguṇa, therefore, is another element present in the object. The object undergoes constant changes. This change or movement is due to the presence of another principle which is called rajoguṇa. Thus sattva, rajas and tamas, which are objective and ultimate, are responsible for all sorts of experience of a puruṣa. These guṇas are not qualities but substances. They are called guṇas because they act as ropes for binding puruṣa and also because they are subordinated to the puruṣa whose interest they serve. All objects of the world, (both physical and psychical) are the results of the different permutations and combinations of these three ultimate reals. In the psychical sphere, the element of sattva which is of the nature of illumination, dominates whereas

in the sphere of the physical objects, tamoguṇa, which is of the nature of heaviness and covering, becomes the dominating element.

These three guṇas again appear as pleasure, pain and indifference from the point of view of feeling. One and the same object is capable of producing three different feelings in three types of mind due to the presence of three guṇas in it.

These guṇas are not only unconscious, they are also essentially changeable. They always remain together forming a unity.

The guṇas, when they act together for the production of object, exert mutual influence upon one another and by so doing, they bring into existence new qualities and new substances; but there is not only conflict, there is also co-operation among the guṇas. The guṇas must be arranged in proper superordination. Their proper manipulation alone will bring about creation of new things and new varieties.

The three gunas change in two ways which are known as sarūpa pariṇāma and virupa parināma. Sarūpa pariṇāma exists in the state of equilibrium of the three guṇas when they exert equal influences without creating any commotion. This state of equilibrium is absolutely indeterminate, undifferentiated and indefinite and it is called Prakṛti. The word pariṇāma always implies change or modification which is of the form of action (kriyātmaka). Activity belongs to rajoguna. Hence in sarupa pariṇāma too, sattva and tamas must be related to rajas so as to be able to undergo homogeneous modification (i. e. modification in which one guṇa will not overpower the other). Rajas possesses kriyāśakti by nature; but this kriyāśakti of rajas becomes excessive when there is a disturbance in the Prakṛti-sakti due to puruṣārtha samyoga. In the equilibriated state, there is no excess in the activity of the rajoguṇa. The natural activity of rajas becomes excessive in the Vaiṣamyavastha as a result of which there are excessive modifications in sattva, rajas and tamas. The result of such excess in the activities of the guṇas is the production of new categories.

Prakṛti

Prakṛti is not an entity distinct from the three guṇas. When the guṇas are held in a state of equilibrium and there is no manifestation of any characteristic, it is called the Prakṛti-state or the equilibriated state of the three guṇas. This equilibriated state (Prakṛti) is absolutely indeterminate, undifferentiated and homogeneous and it exists only as the possible source of energy of the whole world. This state of equipoise is the ultimate background of the world, and is not caused by any other principle. Since Prakṛti is the uncaused first cause of this multifarious universe, it is unlimited, all-pervasive and infinite.

Prakṛti state is, however, disturbed by the puruṣārtha samyoga. Nature is, no doubt unconscious, still there is some inherent teleology (unconscious) in the guṇas as a result of which they undergo evolutionary changes. The inherent teleology means nothing but the disposition of unknowingly serving the purposes of enjoyment and liberation of puruṣa.

Puruṣa

Prakṛti, no doubt, forms the basic objective principle of the whole universe and experience also owes its content to Prakṛti. Even the instruments, which are operative in experience, are the effects of Prakrti; but mere unconscious objects and instruments cannot produce experience. In addition to these, there must be a permanent principle of consciousness to reveal all the changing natural objects in experience. So, the Samkhya has admitted the existence of a pure illuminative consciousness in the form of puruṣa. Purusa in its pure form, is indifferent, neutral, viveki, viṣayī, vibhū, nitya bhoktā, akartā etc. Purusa is viveki only in the sense, that it is the possessor of prakāśātmaka viveka and prakāsātmaka viveka implies simply the manifestation of puruṣa and Prakṛti as different tattvas. Here, viveka does not refer to any intellectual understanding and evaluation of the distinction. The viṣayitva (subjectivity) of purusa also refers to its power of revealing naturally any object that happens to lie in its proximity. Bhoktritva too, does not do any harm to the pure and indifferent nature of puruṣa. Bhoktritva ultimately implies

nothing but the illuminating consciousness that constitutes the nature of pure puruṣa.

Puruṣa, however, is not one. This is because the Samkhya admits real differences in the experiences of pleasures and pains of different jīvas. There are different buddhis and different pratibimbas and so the bimbas also must be different. Real distinction in effects can be produced by really distinct causes. Each puruṣa becomes associated with a particular buddhi through reflection and due to this seeming union, the experiences of the intelligised buddhi are falsely owned by puruṣa through ignorance.

Evolution

Evolution from Prakrti proceeds on two lines—psychical and physical. Psychical evolution results in the production of the intellect, the ego-sense, mind and ten organs where as five subtle elements and five gross elements make their appearance on the physical plane. Both the lines are important in the sense that experience refers to objects on the one hand and instruments of experience on the other.

—:o:—

SAMKHYA AND VIVARANA SCHOOL

In this article I will try to make a comparative analysis of the world-views of the Sāṁkhya and the Vivaraṇa school of the advaita vedānta.

The status, which the advaita vedānta allocates to the external world is unique in the history of philosophy. The world, according to Śaṁkara, is a fact and yet not a fact, is real and yet not reai, is not imaginary and yet imaginary. In fact, it is simply an enigma for human intellect.

So long as we are in a bound condition, we cannot straightway reject the world. Although the world eludes the grasp of our intellect, still in the empirical level, nobody can turn his eyes away from it. The Saṁkhya believes in the metaphysical reality of the world ; this is because, according to the Sāṁkhya, experience is always real. This, however, is not so according to advaita vedanta. It holds as real only the transcendental state of existence. Hence, while the advaita vedānta upholds the theory of the empirical validity of creation only the Saṁkhya does not hold that creation is false from any point of view.

The nature of the enigmatic creation is explained in the advaita vedanta with the help of the category of indefinite which is neither sat (is) nor asat (is not). 'Sat' is that category which always is and is never negated in any level of existence and at any period of time. 'Asat', on the other hand, is that which never becomes an object of experience such as the skyflower. The world, however, is experienced as something real so long as we remain in a bound condition deluded by the veiling power of avidyā. In the state of ignorance, no man feels the falsehood or unreality of the world. The world is there ; it is existent, it is a fact, it is imposing etc., such is the experience of the ordinary man. Hence, the world cannot be

described as 'asat'. Again, when Brahman is realised, the world appearance vanishes immediately. Since, the world-appearance does not continue to manifest itself at all times and in all levels of existence, it cannot be deseribed as 'sat'. It is due to this peculiar characteristic of the world that it has been described as anirvacanīya. For Sāṁkhya, on the other hand, the world, in every sense, is real. It is never realised as an illusion in the manner of the world seen in a dream.

Sṛṣṭidṛṣṭivāda of the Vivaraṇa School

The empirical reality of the world has not been equally emphasised by all the schools of the advaita vedanta as a result of which we come across two different views, namely sṛṣṭidṛṣṭivada and dṛṣṭi sṛṣṭivada in regard to the status of the world.

The sṛṣṭidṛṣṭivada is advocated by the vivaraṇa school of the advaita vedanta. According to the opinion of this school, avidya or Maya, which is the changeable matrix of the world, has its locus in Brahman (Brahmapada). Maya is the creative power of God and it possesses the capacity of effecting modifications or vikāras. The world is not an effect of jivaśritā avidyā (avidya located in the jīva). It is, on the other hand, a product of the creative power (i. e. Maya) of God. Hence, creation in no sense, is dependent on Jīva. Both the jīva and the world are supported by God. Brahman is the cause of creation. The world of multiplicity which is actually apprehended during the waking state of the empirical life as something 'given', is the product of the positive insensient power (jaḍatmika śakti) of God who is controlling the movements of the bound śouls. So, in the empirical life, an individual has to perceive what is created for him by God. In the Pancadaśī, it has been clearly stated that the creation of worldly objects is the function only of God who possesses creative power in the form of Maya. God creates the world of duality which serves rather as a help than as an obstacle to liberation.

"Abādhakam sādhakam ca
dvaitamīśvaranirmitam."
Chapter 4, 42.

The world can be viewed from different points of view. From the point of view of śruti and knowledge, the world is tuccha (non-existent). From the point of view of empirical reasoning, the world is anirvacanīya and from the point of view of practical life, the world is real. It should not, however, be thought that since Māyā changes into the form of the world, the world is supported by Māyā and not by Brahman. Threads are first spun out from cotton and then the cloth is produced from the threads. Here, the threads are not to be regarded as the substratum of the cloth. The real substratum is cotton. Similar is the case with Brahman, Maya and the world. Since, jīva is, in no way, connected with the creation of the world, the world is wholly independent of the jīva. It is because there is creation, that there is the apprehension of creation by the jīva. The creation of the world has proceeded from Prakṛti or Maya under the direct supervision and control of God.

Tamaḥ Pradhāna Prakṛtestadbhoga yesvarājnayā
Viyatpavanatejo'mbubhuvobhutānnijajnire

Pancadaśi

The reality of the world in the empirical sphere can never be denied. The reason why one has to admit the metaphysical unreality of the world is that the world is self-discrepant. No object, in our experience, admits of a finally satisfactory explanation. If we try to ascertain the real nature of a blue lotus, we feel helpless as we can neither say that blue and lotus are wholly identical (because we are using two different words) nor can we say that they are wholly different because the blueness of the lotus can never be thought of as existing apart from the lotus like the cow and the horse. The relation of samavāya will be of no help because then we will need other relations to relate samavāya to both the terms and the process will go on to infinity. So, the nature of the blue lotus cannot be satisfactorily ascertained. No self-discrepant object can have metaphysical reality. Empirically, however, the world is real and as such is different from the phenomenal object (Prātibhāsika vastu). A Prātibhāsika vastu

is more or less a private object of experience whereas an empirically real object is experienced by all bound souls in the same manner. Padmapada has stated that when he uses the word 'mithyā' or the word 'adhyasta' in relation to the objective world he simply means to say that the objective world is, indescribable in character. Māyā, which is the cause of the world has been described in the scripture as sadasadvilakṣaṇā nirvacanīyā and the world, being a modification of such a cause, possesses the same nature. The object, however, is not identical with knowledge as has been advocated by the buddhistic vijnānavāda. The external objects like blue and yellow manifest themselves each excluding the other, but knowledge is always apprehended as a single unity. Had blue, yellow etc. been identical with knowledge, then knowledge also would have been manifested as external and also as each excluding the other. As it is not so, the object must be admitted as different from knowledge. The object has non-apprehensional existence (ajñata sattā) and when the object is known, it is manifested by consciousness delimited by vṛtti and becomes fit for practical use. It is not the ego which is creating the object. Both the object and the ego are the creations of Maya located in pure consciousness. According to Vidyāraṇya, ordinary human beings have no reason to doubt the reality of Maya. From the standpoint of the ordinary worldly man, Maya is real and the world is real. Vidyaraṇya has asserted :—

"Sāṁkhya kaṇādabaudhā dairjagadbhedo yathā yathā utpreks a te .nekayuktyabhavatvesa tathā tathā."

"The followers of Sāṁkhya, Vaiśeṣika, the Buddhist and other schools have established with quite an array of arguments the real nature of the multiplicity in the universe. Let them have these, we have no quarrel with them". (Pancadasi, English translation : Swami Swahananda). Since the world, which is the effect of Maya, is undeniably manifested, its existence in the empirical level can never be denied. All people admit, in their experience, the existence of the world. The advaita vedantins do not hesitate to declare that one should stick to Sāṁkhya realism in the empirical level of existence (Vyavahāra Sāṁkhya

nayaḥ). The world view, presented to us by the vivaraṇa school, seems to have developed under the influence of the Sāṁkhya realism as, otherwise, such a strong leaning towards a realistic view of the world would not have crept up into the advaita Brahmavāda of Saṁkaracharya. Like the Saṁkhya, the sṛṣṭidṛṣṭivādī too, admits the non-apprehensional existence or the extra-apprehensional existence of the object. Maya, which is the changeable matrix of the world, is indeed a destructible principle according to sṛṣṭidṛṣṭivāda; but if we admit Māyā as a single category representing the jaḍātmikā sṛṣṭiśakti of God, then it becomes difficult for us to believe in the destruction of Maya when only one soul is liberated. How can one and the same Maya be both annihilated and existent at the same time? We cannot suppose that all souls will be liberated simultaneously as such a presumption will not have the sanction of experience. This difficulty however is solved satisfactorily in the Sāṁkhya where Prakṛti is not destroyed.

Sāṁkhya view

According to Sāṁkhya, Prakṛti which is the mutable material cause of the world is eternal. This insentient cause is active by nature. Puruṣa is not the efficient cause. It does not participate actively in the process of creation. It simply vitalises Prakṛti by means of sannidhi and makes the 'unconscious cause' fit for creation. In the process of creation, it is Prakṛti that occupies the primary place and not the inactive consciousness in the form of puruṣa. The Sāṁakhya does not believe in Prakṛtināśa (destruction of Prakṛti); when a particular puruṣa is liberated, Prakṛti simply ceases to create for him. Creation is meant for the bound souls only who have got to reap the fruits of their prārabdha karmas. Each object is produced for the enjoyment of a particular puruṣa; if the bhoga samskāras of a particular purusa are destroyed, then the bhogyatā (capacity for enjoyment) of the puruṣa comes to an end. So, Prakṛti does not create anything for the enjoyment of that puruṣa. Prakṛti ceases to be effective in relation to him. Prakṛti of the Sāṁkhya school does not affect the life of the liberated puruṣa

in any way, does not create anything for his enjoyment, does not entice him, does not make him interested, in the world show any more. In other words, Prakṛti has become as good as non-existent for him.

Conclusion

On a careful reflection, therefore, it will appear to everybody that the Sāṁkhya idea of cessation of the activity of Prakṛti virtually amounts to its non-existence in relation to a liberated soul, although actually it is not destroyed. Even Vidyaraṇya has said :—

"Naparatitistayorbādhaḥ
kintu mithyātva niścayaḥ"

(By negation, it does not mean that the world ceases to be perceptible to the senses, it means the conviction of its illusory nature). Thus, according to both the schools, the jīvanmukta puruṣa sees the world, in a disinterested manner, but there is this difference that while the follower of the advaita vedanta believes it as false, the follower of the Saṁkhya school believes it as heya (of inferior value).

In fact, if Prakṛti cannot create any kind of change in the mind and activity of the liberated person, then from his point of view, the existence of Prakṛti is as good as its non-existence. Just as the Maya of the sṛṣṭidṛṣṭivādī school of the advaita vedanta loses both the āvaraṇa śakti and the vikṣepa sakti in relation to the liberated person, so also the Prakṛti of the Sāṁkhya school loses both kinds of power in regard to a mukta puruṣa. If Prakṛti continues to exist even when both the powers are lost, its existence is of very little significance to the liberated soul. The continued existence of Prakṛti is necessary simply to explain continuity in creation for all bound souls.

In the worldly condition, creation is accepted as real by both the schools. The world-cause, according to both, is a triguṇātmikā mutable and unconscious principle. But according to

advaita vedanta, this creative principle is not independently active whereas according to Isvara Krishna, Prakṛti is independently active. According to Bhikṣu, however, both Puruṣa and Prakṛti are in a relation of avibhāga with God. Vijñana bhiksu has asserted that although Prakṛti possesses mutability by its own nature, still God is to be regarded as the controller of Nature as otherwise uncontrolled creativity of Nature cannot be channelised in a proper manner. There is adhiṣṭhan-adhiṣṭheya relation (the relation of substratum and supported) between God and Prakṛti. Bhiksu has defined adhisthana Karaṇa as that, which by remaining inseparably related to the real and changeable material cause, prompts the latter to create the cosmic order. In the light of this definition given by Bhiksu in his vijnānāmṛta bhāsya, we can say that puruṣa of the Saṁkhya Kārikā may also be regarded as the substratum of Prakṛti, because the all pervading Prakṛti, is eternally related to the all-pervading puruṣa which by means of reflection, transforms prakṛti into an intelligised Nature and gives it meaning and value as the potential energy of the world. Again, although Isvara Krishna has not described Prakṛti as the upādhi of puruṣa, yet the Samkhya Karika provides us with legitimate grounds for regarding Prakṛti as an adjunct of Puruṣa. It is due to reflection of consciousness in Prakrti that there is an intimate connection between the two. In the reflected consciousness are falsely revealed as non-different, all natural changes due to ignorance. (upasamipavartini ādadhāti svakīyam rūpamiti upādhi). Considered from this point of view, Prakrti of the Samkhya Karika can very well be regarded as an upādhi of Puruṣa. Further, it is not inappropriate to say that Prakrti of the Sāmkhya School is subordinated to consciousness (cetanadhina) if by such subordination, one understands simply that Prakṛti is incapable of doing any creative activity without being related to consciousness. Such subordination is not incompatible with the independence of Prakṛti. Prakṛti will lose her independence if we say that it is only the will of the conscious principle that produces activity in Prakṛti. It is true, that

Puruṣa vitalises Nature by means of sannidhi and thereby makes her fit for creation, but that does not in any way impair the independent nature of Prakṛti. The reflection of consciousness in Nature is simply the exciting force behind creation. It is not the efficient cause of creation. There is no real relation between the world and the principle of consciousness. Prakṛti, the root cause of the world, is naturally different from Puruṣa and is independently active, Thus. even by keeping intact, the independent nature of Prakṛti, we can admit its subordination to consciousness in some sense. In the advaita vedanta also, Brahman is not associated with māyā by means of will because a qualityless tattva can never be supposed to possess will. Considered in this manner, the sṛṣṭidṛṣṭivada of the vivaraṇa school comes very close to the Sāmkhya realism so far as their world-views are concerned.

—: o :—

SĀṂKHYA PURUṢA AND THE JĪVĀ-SĀKṢĪ OF THE ADVAITA VEDĀNTA

In the *Sāmkhya-Kārikā* (No. 19) Puruṣa has been described as a witness, a seer only without any activity. The said Karika runs as follows :

"*Tasmāt-ca viparyāsāt siddham sākṣitvam asya puruṣasya.*"

The use of the word '*sākṣitvam*' in the Karika has led some scholars of India* to assume that puruṣa of the Sāmkhya philosophy is similar to the *jiva-sākṣi* of the Advaitavedānta : but in the Sāmkhya philosophy, the objects to be revealed only

---

*Dr. Sita Ram Goswami—*Vedānta darśane paramārtha-tattva* page 15 (original book written in Bengali) 'Puruṣa has been described as sākṣī in the *Sāmkhya-kārikā* (19)

. . . Those who believe in *sākṣi* do not recognize that the mind is an organ (*indriya*). Those who admit that the mind is an organ do not believe in *sāksi*. So, pleasures and pains which are generally admitted as objects of internal perception, are all objects to be known only by the *sākṣi* according to the view of the Sāmkhyas. Although, puruṣa has been mentioned as *sākṣi* in the *Sāmkhya-kārikā*, yet the objects to be known only by the *sākṣi* have not been clearly mentioned. It is because Sāmkhya has admitted the existence of *sākṣi* without clearly determining the objects which are to be known only by the witness, its definition of perception given in kārika 5 has confused the commentators to a great extent. The commentators have thought that this definition gives us the characteristics of both external perception and internal perception. But truly speaking, according to Sāmkhya, external perception occurs through the functioning of the external sense organs : internal perception is not due to the operation of any *indriya*. This is *sākṣi pratyakṣa*. Unless this position is admitted, recognition of puruṣa as *sākṣi* is senseless like the utterings of a mad person. (*Vedānta darśane paramārtha tattva*)

by the witnessing self (*jiva-sākṣi*) are not mentioned after the fashion of the Advaita-vedanta. (*Vedāntadarsane paramārtha tattva*)

Kind of objects revealed only by the sāksi-caitanya or the witnessing self.

The objects which are generally admitted as the objects of the witnessing consciousness (*jiva-sāksi*) are those which are not cognized by the activity of the *pramāṇas* (sources of knowledge). Internal organ and internal modes (*antahkaraṇa-vṛttis*) are, for example, admitted as objects to be cognized only by the witness (*Sākṣya-vastu*). Things of the world are known through *vṛttis* (internal modes) originating from the activity of the means of knowledge (*pramāṇas*). The internal modes, however, are cognized only by the witness in the individual self without the functioning of any one of the approved sources of knowledge. According to the Vedānta-paribhāṣā, which does not admit that the mind is an *indriya* (sense organ), pleasures, pains etc. are also objects to be revealed by the witnessing consciousness.

Jiva-saksi of the advaita-vedanta.

In the philosophy of the Advaita-vedānta, the knowing and the experiencing self is regarded as false and phenomenal. This false and phenomenal ego is a mixture of this (*idam*) and not this (*anidam*). In other words it is a unified category of *antaḥkaraṇa* and *cit*, both fused into one. So, this " I " of the Advaita-vedānta is both objective and subjective, changing and also the static perceiver of changes. " I " is recognized both as unhappy and as the object of love. The changing aspect of the experiencing ego is known as the *pramātā* and it is this *pramātā* that reaches the external object through the *antaḥkaraṇa*. But a changeable ego alone is not capable of explaining how different experiences of the ego, happening at different periods of time, can be gathered together round a single and identical conscious centre so as to give rise to such phenomena as a feeling of identity, memory, recognition etc. In addition to *pramātṛ-caitanya* or changeable consciousness, a static witnessing self (*jiva-sākṣi*) has got to be recognized in the philosophy of the

Advaita school. Hence, in the non-dualistic philosophy, the *jīva* or the experiencing ego comprises both *jiva sākṣi* and *pramātā*. Consequently, objects to be known exclusively by the *jiva-sākṣī* are definitely mentioned in the philosophy of the Advaita-school.

Samkhya Position Explained

In the philosophy of the Sāmkhya, however, no mention of *pramātṛ-caitanya* as distinguished from the *sākṣi-caitanya* is found in any context. Here the individual or the *jiva* refers to that puruṣa which has been caught in the snare of *prakṛti* through reflection. Due to reflection, the unconscious intellect appears as conscious and it is the intelligised *buddhi* that actually gets related to the objects through its modifications. Modification of the intellect in the form of the object is the *pramāṇa* and the reflection of puruṣa in it is *pramā*. Although, in the opinion of this school, *buddhi* or the intellect is the real substratum of knowledge, still it appears as if puruṣa is having this phenomenal knowledge because of reflection acting in co-operation with ignorance. Since in the Sāmkhya, puruṣa appears as the knower of the object, there is no need to assume the existence of another *sākṣi* in the Vedānta sense. When buddhi comes in contact with the worldly object, it assumes the forms of these objects and all these forms or modes (*vṛttis*) apparently get changed into knowledge through the reflection of *cit* in the intellect. Due to *aviveka*, this apparent change in the character of *vṛttis* gives rise to a false sense of non-discrimination between puruṣa and *buddhi*. It seems as if puruṣa is non-different from *buddhi* and there is only one principle and not two. Here, although the puruṣa of Sāmkhya seems to perform the same function as is performed by the *jīva-sakṣi* of the Advāita-vedānta, the two do not possess the same status. *Jiva-sākṣi* of the Advaita-vedānta is the static consciousness within the experiencing ego, the changeable aspect of which is the *pramātā*. Both *sākṣi* and *pramātā* are equal (*samakakṣa*) in the sense that both of them are false and limited in space and time. In the philosophy of the Sāmkhya, on the other

hand, the puruṣa (the *sākṣi*) has been admitted as real and it is not limited in space and time. It does not form an element of the experiencing ego (which is formed in the *buddhi* with the reflected consciousness of puruṣa united with *buddhi's* own conceptual determinations).

Sākṣi or witness literally denotes that principle which is capable of revealing anything independently that occurs before it. Therefore, any *tattva*, which is self-revealing and is also the revealing principle of the world, may be called *sākṣi* or the witness. In order to be described as *sākśi*, it is not necessary for consciousness to assume the role that has been taken up by *jiva-sakṣī* of the Advaita school. Moreover, if puruṣa is brought down to the level of the phenomenal *jiva-sākṣi*, then the followers of the Advaita will not be in a position to raise any objection against the Sāmkhya theory of multiplicity of selves as *jiva-sāksis* are many in number.

In fact, non-recognition of *ṣākṣi-caitanya* as distinguished from the *pramāṭṛ-caitanya* in the manner suggested by the Advaita-vedānta has not created any difficulty in the epistemological position of the Sāmkhya Darshana. Cognition, pleasures, pains etc. actually subsist in *buddhi* and the spirit simply appears to have knowledge of objects, pleasures, pains etc. through reflection and *aviveka*. *Ekameva darśanam, khyātireva darśanam* happens to puruṣa and not to a fictitious knower formed of *sākṣi-caitanya* and *pramāṭṛ-caitanya*. Phenomenal knowledge is gained in the following manner :

Perception : In the case of perception, say the visual perception of a jar, the eye comes in contact with a jar as a result of which there are certain *indriya-vṛttis* which are presented to the mind. The mind analyses and synthesises those *vṛttis* and presents them to the intellect. Then through the functioning of the mind and the external organ, the intellect assumes the form of the jar (the *buddhivṛttis* or the *pramāṇa*). Finally, the consciousness of the self is reflected in this objectified form of the *buddhi* and the object is immediately revealed. This is the perceptual knowledge of the jar. The question that arises here is : who is the knower of this know-

ledge ? According to Advaita epistemology, the knower is the category formed of *sākṣi* and *pramātri-caitanya* (*antaḥkaraṇopahita caitanya* and *antaḥkaraṇāvacchinna caitanya*) : this knower is as false as the known. *Sākṣi-caitanya* (witnessing consciousness) constitutes the permanent nature of this metaphysically false but empirically real experiencing ego ; and due to its presence, the personal identity which is absolutely essential for being a knower, can be accounted for from the point of view of the Advaita-vedānta. In the Sāmkhya, however, both the knower and the known, are metaphysically real. What is false is the *abheda grahana* (non-discrimination) of the intellect and the puruṣa. Puruṣa—the seer—becomes seemingly associated with *buddhi* through reflection, and due to *aviveka*, it seems to us as if only one principle is operating in the perceptual knowledge. According to dualistic Sāmkhya, the objective ground is as real as the subjective one, and puruṣa can serve as the subjective ground of knowledge without being dragged down to the position of the *sākṣi* of the Advaita-vedānta. In the Advaita-vedānta, a false knower has been formed to match with the false object of the false and phenomenal knowledge, because unless the individual knower is false along with the known, non-dualism of the Advaita school cannot be logically upheld.

Inference : Inferential knowledge is that knowledge in which the modification of the intellect in the form of the inferred object occurs in the absence of the contact of sense-organ with the object. Here, the middle term is perceived, and the major term is inferentially known through its relation to the middle term.

Śabda : In the case of *śabda*, the intellect assumes the form of the object about which an assertion has been made by a trustworthy person. In all these cases (perception, inference, and verbal testimony) puruṣa is the apparent knower through *aviveka*, and therefore, there is no need for the recognition of any other static consciousness in the form of the *sākṣi-caitanya* of the Advaita type.

Cognition of pleasures, pains etc. so far as pleasures, pains etc. are concerned, these are the objects of internal perception (according to Sāmkhya). Mind is the *indriya* that operates in the perception of these objects. Dr. Sita Ram Goswami is wrong in holding that mind is not an *indriya* according to the Sāmkhya school. In the *Sāmkhya-kārikā* (27) it has been stated: *ubhayātmakam atra manaḥ samkalpakaṃ indriyaṃ ca sādharmyāt*. In the *Sāmkhya Pravacana Bhāṣya*, too, we come across the following passage :

Indrasya saṃghāteśvarasya karaṇamindriyam tathā cāhaṁkārakāryatve sati karaṇatvamindriyatvamiti,

Further, in the *Tattva kaumudi*, Vācaspati Miśra has emphatically asserted that the mind is an *indriya* because it has properties common to *indriyas* : 'The property meant is that consisting in its having for its constituent cause, the I-principle abounding in the *sattva* attribute and not in its being a characteristic of Indra (spirit) : for this latter property belongs to the will and the I-principle also . . . Thus then, being the characteristic of the spirit should be regarded only as an explanation of the derivation of the term *indriya* ; it cannot be said to form its connotation.' (English translation : G. Jha.)

It would therefore appear that it is not proper to assert that the mind is not an *indriya* and that pleasures and pains etc. cannot be the objects of internal perception. Cognition of everything according to Sāmkhya, is due to the reflection of puruṣa in the intellect. Cognition of pleasures and pains, too, occur in the same process. Even then, pleasures and pains cannot be regarded as *sākṣi-bhāsya* in the Advaita sense because these are known through mind which is an *indriya*. Mind is a *tattva* different from *buddhi* and *ahaṁkāra*. It is to be classed with the *indriyas*. It is because the mind is an organ that the definition of perception given in the *Sāmkhya-karika* (*prativiṣayādhyavasāyo dṛṣṭam*) has been interpreted by Vācaspati Miśra in a manner so as to cover both external and internal perceptions. ('What the term *prativiṣaya* stands for is the *indriya* in relation with the object.

Adhyavasāya is cognition, the function of the intellect : in fact *adhyavasāya* stands for that excess flow of *sattva guṇa* which results from the suppression in the intellect of *tamas* due to the contact of the *indriyas* with their respective objects. This is *vṛtti* or knowledge.' (*Tattva kaumudi*). Since the mind is admitted as an *indriya*, pleasures, pains, etc. are to be regarded as the objects of internal preception.

Cognition of internal modes : The internal modes, however, cannot be known through other *vṛttis*. These are revealed directly by the reflected consciousness of puruṣa without the help of any other media. So, the internal modes are *sākṣi-bhāsya* in the Samkhya sense : (that is in the sense of *puruṣa bhāsya*) and not in the sense of Advaita-vedanta.

Comments

Truely speaking, it is the realistic frame-work of Sāmkhya that makes the assumption of a *sākṣi caitanya* superfluous in the Advaita sense. In the Sāmkhya, no false knower is knowing falsely a false world. *Aviveka* in Samkhya implies misappropriation of something by the puruṣa which does not really belong to it. Phenomenal knowledge or *vṛtti* is real and its substratum—*buddhi*—is also real. So is the puruṣa which is by nature *asaṁga* and unchangeable. The worst mistake (*mahādoṣa*) therefore lies in misappropriation or confused perception. The reflection of puruṣa-*caitanya* in the intellect together with beginningless ignorance is causing the confused perception of the puruṣa due to which intellectual concepts appear as self's own possession. So puruṣa, here, is serving as the static background of the phenomenal knowledge, but this puruṣa is not a *sākṣi* in the Advaita sense as it does not form the part of a false and fictitious ego which is limited in space and time. By describing puruṣa as *sākṣi*, the Sāmkhya philosophers have not made any 'insane statement' *sākṣāt paśyati iti sākṣi*. Puruṣa, therefore, is *sākṣi* in this sense in which *brahman* too is *sākṣi* (*sākṣicetā kevalo nirguṇaśca ..Sveta. Upaniṣad* 6-11).

THEISTIC SAMKHYA AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF RAMANUJA ; A REVIEW ON THE BASIS OF CULTURAL HISTORY OF THE AGE

That the philosophy of Rāmānuja has its root in the Ṛgveda, Upaniṣads, the Bhagavadgītā, the Purāṇas and the Pancarātras etc. is no longer a concealed fact in the scholarly world. This truth has already been brought to light through the efforts of the eminent scholars ; but the intimate bond that exists between the theistic Sāṃkhya and the philosophy of Rāmānuja needs to be explicated fully.

Historical Background of the Philosophy of Rāmānuja

If we carefully study the cultural history of our country when Rāmānuja made his appearance, we shall find that the social and religio-philosophical atmosphere was ripe for the emergence of the Viśistādvaita philosophy of Rāmānuja with its unique emphassis on jñāna, bhakti and prapatti. This was an age when both Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas were trying to fight Buddhism on the ground of bhakti. Śaṁkara also tried to fight Buddhism on the ground of knowledge : but his highly intellectual philosophy of Nirguṇa Brahman was not potent enough to satisfy the hearts of the devotees. In Śaṁkara's writings, religious worship and devotion found only a position inferior to the meditation on Nirguṇa Brahman. Truly speaking Śaṁkara has deprived God of His Godliness by reducing Him to a false category. God, caught in the snare of falsity, is no God at all. Such a false God cannot awaken that deep love and respect in the heart of a devotee which, in due course, can shape into paramā bhakti. Nirguṇa Brahman, on the other hand, is devoid of mental modifications ; As such, like an unconscious object, it cannot know itself. Such a quailityless Brahman cannot also warm up the heart of a devotee and devotion cannot spring forth in a torrential flow in the presence

of such an absolute. So, just as for Buddhism, K.J. Sanders has remarked that when we go through the Dhammapada, we find ourselves "in a moonlit world" beautiful, yet cold..our hearts are not stirred by any assurance of the reality of the unseen, in the same manner Śaṁkara also failed to stir the hearts of the devotees by his assurance only of the reality of a Nirguṇa Brahman.

Again, the Buddhistic doctrine of anattā, resulting in the denial of permanent essence both in the material and psychical spheres, already led to the arousal of discontent among some sections of the people who were interested in the positive side of life and were not willing to believe in the emptiness of the world. Śaṁkara's theory of the empirical reality of the world was equally unconvincing. Buddhism was already in a state of decline in Central and Southern India about the middle of the seventh century. It was also the period when the Ālvārs, with their soul-stirring devotion of God, flourished in South India. The most distinguishing feature of the Alvār movement was its catholic spirit. According to these God-intoxicated singers, God is accessible to all without any distinction of caste, rank and culture and that by self-surrendering devotion to such a God, everybody can obtain liberation. The attempt to popularise Hinduism through the Purāṇas, with their Śāmkhya-oriented theories of creation and dissolution, which started in the brilliant age of the Guptas, has also made considerable progress by the time. So, the ground was prepared for the introduction of the religio-philosophy of Rāmanuja which was competent enough to feed and nourish the famished hearts of the age by doing justice both to God and the world of living beings and non-living things. In the formulation of such a conception, Rāmānujā seemed to have been very much influenced by the theistic Sāmkhya and the philosophy of the Yoga-school.

Rāmānuja's Indebtedness to Theistic Sāṁkhya

The main teachings of the Upaniṣads relate to (1) the causality of the spiritual principle and (2) the non-difference

between the cause and the effect. Śaṁkara has tried to effect a harmony between these two śruti truths with the help of the theory of the falsity of the world,—a theory which can satisfy only a very few intellectually gifted persons. The average man feels keenly and believes sincerely in the reality of the world. He also believes in God as the Creator and ruler of the world He has in his mind, a deep love for God who is looked upon as the individual's only refuge. The dualistic Saṁkhya or the classical Sāṁkhya has admitted the non-difference between the cause and the effect as well as the reality of the visible world ; but has denied the causality of the spirit. The pre-classical theistic Saṁkhya, however, has admitted both, but the relation between the three tattvas has not been properly developed thercin. This task, Rāmānuja has taken up and has done it in a remarkable manner by introducing the conception of his cidacidviśiṣṭa Brahman.

Upaniṣadic Sāṁkhya

Rāmānuja himself has based his philosophy on the teachings of the Unaniṣads. In his opinion, his conception of the absolute as a triune unity is formed in accordace with the Upaniṣads. Indeed, the theiṣtic Saṁkhya of the Upaniṣads does contain in a germinal form the conception of Brahman as presented by Rāmānuja. The Śveta. Upaniṣad tells us frankly that there are three eternal and ultimate entities which constitute the absolute and that these are (i) the powerless and ignorant soul, (ii) the powerful and all knowing God and (iii) the eternal Prakṛti which exists for the enjoymeut of the soul[1]. Again, in the same Upaniṣad it has been stated that man has got to know the three entities which constitute the Absolute, namely, enjoyer, or the puruṣa, the enjoyed or the Prakṛti and the mover or God.[2] Prakṛti and Puruṣa are inseparably related to God.

That God is the indwelling principle of both spirit and matter and that all things and beings of the universe constitute the body of God, is the explicit utterance of the Bṛhad. Upaniṣad.[3]

In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad too, it has been clearly stated that God is the immanent principle of all things including even the ontradictories. Thus, according to Upaniṣadic Śaṁkhya, Puruṣa and Prakṛti are eternally dependent on God and are never separable from Him. It is, therefore not incorrect to conjecture that these Saṁkhya-ideas of the Upaniṣads have paved the way for the emergence of the cidacidviśiṣṭa Brahman of Rāmānuja.

Theistic Sāṁkhya of the Mahābhārata

That there is a supreme soul that causes Pṛakṛti to evolve in many ways (Bahudhātmā prakurvita prakṛtim prasavātmikām) and that this supreme soul is the Lord who makes Nature play with her own creative energy are clearly admitted in the theistic Sāṁkhyā of the Mahābhārata. The spiritual principle is the highest reality that transcends and includes both prakṛti and the individuai soul (sarvāṇyeva guṇair vyāpya kṣetrajñeṣu yudhiṣṭhira). The highest principle has no rival or opponent. In other words, it is the Supreme principle of the whole universe because Pradhāna is included in this eternal being.[4]

Materiality and spirituality, thus, seem to become the lower and the higher phases of the highest being and these two phases, though different in character, are still in a begginningless association, since, such a union is necessary for creation and maintenance of the world. Nature is the mutable principle that brings into existence all things of the world. The innumerable ripples and rythms of the worldly life—its flowers and thorns, its pleasures and pains – all are due to the dynamic power, often termed as Nature or Prakṛti. She is, however, guided in her action by the highest spiritual principle. Such an account of the theistic Saṁkhya may reasonably be regarded as having a significant historical link with the Rāmānujian conception of the highest reality which is, in inseparable relation with cit and acit, its two different modes. Further the statement "bahudhatmā prakurvita" etc. implies that prior to creation there was no differentiation between

jaḍa & cetana (sadeva saumyedam etc.) Such differentiation has been made only after creation. It is realy the plurality of buddhis that has caused plurality in the case of the jīvas as well. Rāmānuja too has accepted that each jīva is qualified by a particular acit in the form of a particular buddhi.

The Bhagavadgitā

The conception of the ultimate reality comprising within itself both Prakṛti and Puruṣa as the lower and the higher natures, is present in the Saṁkhya of the Bhagvadgitā as well. In fact, Ramānuja's conception of Brahman as qualified by cit and acit in subtle forms cen very well be regarded as an improvement upon the Gita conception of Puruṣottama. The cosmic form of the Lord which was seen by Arjuna, lays bare the fact that even the forms of the worldly objects are nothing but the divine modifications of one Supreme Divinity. The whole universe, with its manifold divisions, is gathered together in one body which is the body of the puruṣottama. Thus the body-soul relation between God on the one hand and spirit and matter on the other, has been suggested in the Bhagvadgītā conception of the three tattvas—God, puruṣa and prakṛti.

The Purāṇas

In the Pauranic Sāṁkhya also Puruṣa and Prakṛti are regarded as different forms of God. According to Viṣṇupurāṇa, God is the real container of puruṣa and prakrti which are different from the Divine nature—a conception, which we find in the philosophy of Rāmānuja as well in his acceptanee of natural and essential difference between God on the one hand and cit and acit on the other.

The Markandeya Purāṇa believes that puruṣa and prakṛti are not finally independent. These are the two forms of Vāsudeva who connects or separates them for the creation and the dissolution of the world.

The Purāṇas generally devote some section of their literatures to the treatment of sṛisti and pralaya of the world and

it is in such a section that we invariably come across the Sāṁkhya conception of the dual principles lying at the root of the manifold world. Rāmānuja's conception of Prakṛti and the process of evolution from Nature bears a very close resemblance to the theistic Sāṁkhya of the epic and the Purāṇas.

The Yoga Philosophy

In regard to God, Ramanuja seems to have been influenced to a certain extent by the conception of God as expounded in the Yoga system. Vācaspati (840 A. D.) has emphatically said that God, according to Yoga, is the director of the teleology of prakṛti. Unconscious Pradhāna, by itself, is incapable of producing the world. It becomes fit for creation only when it is enlivened and inspired by God. God, according to Yoga, is omniscient, omnipotent, compassionate and full of mercy. He is kind enough to remove (of His own accord) all obstacles which His devotee may meet in the path of liberation. The word "Praṇidhāna" used in the Yoga-Sutra 1.23 does not seem to be very different in implication from the word prapatti used by Ramanuja, as both the words emphasise the effectiveness of the self-surrendering devotion to God as a direct means of salvation. The absolute self-surrendering attitude, dedication of everything to God, complete elimination of ego-sense and supreme love for God are the ingredients of both Praṇidhāna and prapatti although the latter word may mean something more.

Conclusion

From what has been stated above in brief outline, it is clear that the theistic Sāṁkhya ideas of different ages have gathered together in various streams to find their final culmination in the perennial fountain of the viśiṣṭadvaita philosophy of Rāmānuja. It is, indeed, an important matter for consideration as to why despite such affinity with the pre-classical theistic Sāmkhya, the philosophy of Rāmānuja has not been admitted as a further advancement of the Sāṁkhya on a theistic line. Perhaps, the reasons for this, may be sought in the social and cultural conditions of the age. We should remember that

the philosophical concepts of a particular age reveal truly the spirit, the ideal and the cultural aspirations of the people. Thoughts never drop down suddenly from above. They grow slowly and gradually in the soil of the country being nurtured and fed by the social and cultural atmosphere of the age. In every age, we do come across conflicts between social and political, economic and axiological ideals. All these conflicts become the source and the support of various concepts which creep into the writings of different philosphers. A true understanding of the philosophical concepts of the age, therefore, presupposes a thorough study of all important changes and developments occurrting in the cultural life of the people in that age.

The salient features of the age of Rāmānuja which may reasonably be supposed to have contributed to the emergence of his philosophy can be summarised in the following manner :

(I) The age extending from 650 A. D. to 1000 A. D. was the age of the great bhakti movement in South India, which was running on two lines of Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism. The Ālvar movement was essentially an extra-ordinary overflowing of the heart which found a very deep root in the soil of South India during seventh or eighth century A. D. The love of God and the spirit of self-surrender which were, thus, the noble and prominent features of the bhakti yoga of the Bhavadgītā developed gradually into intense and passionate love of the Ālvārs.

(II) The Buddhistic principle of considering all men as equal was active in this age. Buddhistic teachings aimed at spreading the ideals of benevolence, compassion and sympathetic joy in the social life so that happiness of the whole of human society might be secured. It was an essential part of the Buddha's aim to assert the equality of all men before law, their equal freedom to mould their own character and

destiny in the universe. The Brahmanical myths about the origin of the different classes of men were regarded as absurd.

(III) The confusion created by the Buddhistic Śūnya Vāda in the minds of the ordinary people by its doctrine of the total unreality of the empirical world.

(IV) The eighth century A.D saw the rise of Śaṁkarācārya. He overpowered the minds of the Hindus of the age with his advaita philosophy which was a remarkable achievement of human intellect. The supremacy of knowledge to action and devotion advocated by Śaṁkara satisfied to a great extent the rational hankerings of his countrymen. Although he succeeded in producing a brilliant philosophy of the absolute, he failed to compose a satisfactory theory of religion to feed the emotionally stirred up hearts of the age.

(V) Rāmānuja was born and brought up in a family which followed the cult of bhakti. So, he developed from his childhood an intense love and admiration for Lord Viṣṇu as a personal God endowed with all auspicious qualities. It was because of his living faith in theism that Rāmanuja was specially attracted by the pre-classical Sāṁkhya of the theistic type.

(VI) Since the time of Īśvara-Kṛṣṇa, however, the dualistic feature of the Sāṁkhya had been regarded as its special character. Īśvar-Kṛṣṇa seems to have felt the absence of any rational justification for our belief in God. He also gave prominence to knowledge as the way of liberation. The extreme disinterestedness of puruṣa and the recognition of prakṛti as the independent cause of all inner and outer modifications of the world, are the important characteristics of the classical Sāṁkhya. The

religious mind of Rāmānuja, was not naturally in favour of accepting the rigid dualism of the classical Sāṁkhya. According to his view, if we do not believe that changes are happening in this world due to Divine inspiration, then we shall never be able to give a satisfactory explanation of the teleological flow from Prakṛti. The universe is grounded in God and pulsates with His life. So, Rāmānuja could not side with the dualistic and atheistic Sāṁkhya of his age. The main aim of Rāmānuja was to synthesise knowledge with devotion and also to find the goal of human life in Divine communion. He was also eager to open the door of religion to all persons without exception so that like Buddhism his philosophy too might be of broad social outlook and catholic spirit. For this reason, in the philosophy of Rāmānuja, we find a very apt blending of the rationalistic attitude of the advaita vedānta with the ethico-religious tendencies of the Yoga and the theistic Sāṁkhya of the pre-classical age, saturated through and through with the milk of love and human sympathy of the Vaiṣṇava School. Hence, we can reasonably conclude by saying that in the Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy of Rāmānuja, it is the theistic line of the Sāṁkhya-thought that has found again an emphatic and rational expression, being wedded to the Advaita Vedānta.

REFERENCES

1. Śveta : 1-9
2 Śveta : 1-12
3. Bṛhad : 3, 7, 3.
4. The Mahābhārata, Śānti Parva-351-17, 18.

VAIŚESIKA CATEGORIES

Vaiśeṣika categories are often wrongly criticised by scholars. Some raise objections against vaiśeṣika categories and assert that there is no point in including "samyoga" in the category of *guṇa*. Such critics hold the view that it is absurd and arbitrary to say that *samyoga* which is apparently a relation can be called a form of *guṇā*. It seems critics have not paid due attention to the philosophical position of the Vaiśeṣika school. In fact, there is strong logical ground in favour of Vaisesika's inclusion of *Samyoga* in the category of guṇa, For example, if we analyse our perceptual cognition of 'a *jar* on the ground' in the light of the Vaiśeṣika philosophy, we find that first of all, we cognize *jar*, ground, and samyoga in a state of Dvandva (separation) and we then become aware of '*a jar on the ground.*' (Samjukta-pratīti). So, Samyoga is different from the *jar* and the ground—although not independent. The *jar* can exist by itself ; so also the ground ; but samyoga cannot exist unless it is supported by *dravya* or substance. Jar is the *adheya* and "ground" is the *adhāra* and samyoga is a third element. It is neither *Ghata-rūpa* nor *Bhūtala-rupa*, nor ubhaya-rupa which is contradictory. If we hold that samyoga is a form of the ground or a form of the jar, then samyoga, being a form of one of the relations may not be connected with the other. So, Samyoga is different from the substances, although it cannot exist without being supported by the substance. It arises in the substance and subsists in the substance. It is, therefore, called Guṇa by the Vaiśeṣika philosophers.

Samyoga cannot be regarded merely as a relation due to another reason also. Sometimes samyoga becomes the cause of action only and does not appear as a relation. As for example, if something is pushed forward by hand, it begins to move. Here, samyoga is the cause of action and is not relation. So, a Vaiśeṣika philosopher is unable to treat samyoga as a relation only.

Further, the fact that in the Vaiśeṣika philosophy, a quality like śukla (white) is treated as an individual, is also not

without rational justification. In the opinion of the Vaiśeṣika thinkers, 'śukla-vyakti' is many in number. Had Śukla been one then the destruction of that one 'white' would have made the world devoid of 'śukla-rūpa' ; white, blue etc. being subject to origination and decay, are many in number but in each of the 'Sukla-vyakti', śuklatva is common. Sāmānya, according to Vaiśeṣika, is that for which the same word is always used, and it also gives us identical knowledge in all cases. Hence, Śuklatva is regarded as sāmānya and Śukla is treated as individual. Sattā is used as Sāmānya on the same ground as it is commonly present in all existent objects and it also gives us identical knowledge in all cases.

In the opinion of some scholars Vaiśeṣika's recognition of the category of Viśeṣa is also illogical. Now let us see if there is actually any logic behind such recognition. When we take into consideration things like wheat, rice, jar, cloth etc. we find that they are all "pārthiva dravyas" and that they are also different from each other. The causes of all these objects are the atoms. Now the Vaiśeṣika holds that unless there are some differences amongst the atoms themselves, their products i. e. Pārthiva-dravyas, will not differ from each other. Since we actually experience difference in the effects, we must also infer the existence of difference in the causes as well i. e. atoms. These differences are called 'viśeṣas' which are supposed to reside in the ultimate constituents of things. Hence it is not proper to say that the category of viśeṣa has been arbitrarily or illogically recognised by the Vaiśeṣika philosophers. We may not accept the form of realism preached by the Vaiśeṣika school, but that is no ground for criticising their philosophical analysis as illogical. In fact, if we carefully study the Vaiśeṣika-analysis of categories, we shall not find it difficult to admit that wonderful accuracy and 'precision in thought and language' have been displayed by them even in that far off age and that this has perhaps no parallel in the history of philosophy.

SAMKHYA AND THE TAOISM OF ANCIENT CHINA

The Sāmkhya philosophy which is, perhaps, the oldest philosophical system in India, has certain characteristic features which give it the semblance of a naturalistic system ; but the belief in salvation as the highest goal of life involving consciousness as a principle superior to nature is very strong and in a sense, this belief is the primary faith of this school of thought. The naturalistic elements, prominent in the classical sāmkhya , are as follows:—

1. Nature is admitted as the root cause of creation—the material as well as the efficient cause. There is no other cause of the world except Prakṛti.
2. The silence of the sāmkhya-kārikā on the problem of God and the apparent antitheistic attitude of the sāmkhya-sūtra.
3. Prakṛti is the equilibriated State of infinitesimal elements called guṇas which are of three kinds and which are the dynamic and unconscious basic stuff of the whole universe.
4. Prakṛti is one as these three kinds of guṇas always remain together forming a unity.
5. Prakṛti acts spontaneously and unconsciously.
6. Prakṛti is uncreated, independently active and all pervading.
7. A belief in cosmic evolution.

Naturalism and Philosophy of Sāṁkhya :

Naturalism, as we know, is a type of Philosophical thinking which accepts Nature as the whole of reality. It denies the existence of anything beyond Nature, behind Nature and

different from Nature. When, according to Naturalism, things in space and time are finally reducible to nothing but minute unconscious dynamic particles, it assumes the form of materialism as well In regard to the classical sāmkhya, however, we can say that although the naturalistic elements are present in this philosophy, still it is not a naturalistic or a materialistic system. It is true, according to the classical sāmkhya, Nature possesses inherent dynamism; even then, the supporters of naturalism or of materialism cannot read in it their favourite doctrines. Had Puruṣa been supposed merely as a principle of illumination having nothing to do (either directly or indirectly) in the process of evolution of the world, then the category of Puruṣa might have been regarded as superfluous and the sāmkhya might have been declared naturalistic or materialistic in spirit. The supporters of the dualistic sāmkhya, however, have repeatedly said that the evolution of the world from Prakṛti is not possible without cicchāẏa, or citsannidhāna or purusārtha samyoga. The use of all these terms definitely prove that puruṣa is absolutely necessary for evolution. In the sāmkhyakarika and also in the samkhya-sūtra, there is ample evidence to prove the necessity of puruṣa and the Karikas in which such a necessity is asserted, are admitted as original.

Classical Sāṁkhya and Taoism of Nature :

It is interesting to find that the Taoism of ancient China bears a close similarity to the classical sāmkhya in respect of its naturalistic traits. The word Tao is generally interpreted in the sense of the way, the path or the course and the Taoism of Nature, in the sense of the way of Nature. According to many scholars, the Taoism in its original form was a type of Naturalism which had laid full stress on the unity and spontaneity of the operations of Nature. In the book XIV of Chuang Tzu's writing, it has been boldly asserted that the phenomena of heaven and earth and of Nature proceed regularly without any apparent cause. Nature is a distinct entity, a living entity and an independent entity. It acts spontaneously of itself. In the Chapter XII of Tao Teh Ching, Lao Tzu has said "The

Tao is simply a spontaneity evolving from itself and not acting from a personal will."

Again in Part I Chapter XXVI he asserts "Man takes his law from Heaven, Heaven takes its law from the Tao. The law of the Tao is its being what it is."

The Sāmkhya Kārikā too has defined Prakṛti as out and out productive (prasavadharmī) meaning thereby that Prakṛti undergoes changes ceaselessly and spontaneously. When Prakṛti evolves evolutes of different categories (Tattvāntara Pariṇāma) then also it acts by its own inherent nature without being impelled by any personal will.

Just as Nature of the sāmkhya is invisible (i.e. not an object of perception) in the same manner the Tao of Lao Tzu is also invisible.

Like the Prakṛti of the classical sāmkhya, the Tao too is regarded as all pervading and as the origin and the merging place of all the things of the world. Nothing in this world is uncovered by the Tao.

"All pervading is the Great Tao ! It may be found in the left hand and on the right..... All things depend on it for production and also return to it and disappear." (Tao Teh Ching, Part I XXXV).

Here, we may refer to samkhya-karika No. 15 where it has been stated that the effect arises from the cause during creation and it returns to the same cause during dissolution. (Here main source and the great merging place of all the effects being the same, i. e. Prakṛti). Prakṛti is also all-pervading (Vyāpī) according to the samkhya-karika No. 10. The Tao of the Taoists also "produces all things, nourishes them, brings them, to their full growth, nurses them, completes them, matures them, maintains them and overspreads them."

The order of Nature, according to Taoism is not only spontaneous but also unconscious. The Taoists hold that the Tao produces things but does not make any claim to the possession of them ; it brings them to maturity without exer-

cising any control over them. Production is both spontaneous and unconscious. It is only when something is produced by conscious efforts that there is a claim to its possession by the producer. The order of Nature is effortless and unconscious. Nature is operating and creating diverse things by means of its own inherent motion. Its activity is not consciously teleological. Things are produced by Nature : if some of them are beneficial for others and are used as such, that also is not intended by Nature. Mosquitoes and gnats suck the blood of man through his skin and live on that but nobody will assert that human beings are produced for the benefit of the mosquitoes and gnats. The Samkhya Karika, on the other hand believes that the movement of Prakṛti is teleological and that the purpose fulfilled by the process of evolution is the purpose of a principle which is other than and different from Prakṛti. Prakṛti is, no doubt the source of the flow of matter and energy but the evolutionary flow is initiated by the sannidhi of puruṣa and it is the good of the puruṣa which is being realised by the process of evolution.

The Taoists, however, do not give us the view of chaotic movements of Nature : the natural movement is spontaneous, yet orderly. There is no conscious controller of Nature, yet there is harmony in natural creation. The naturalism thus propounded by the Taoists, may be regarded as a form of organic naturalism. The harmonious operation of the different parts of Nature is due only to the inherent dictates of the Natural parts themselves. "All things go right as of their will."

There is again resemblance between the Taoism and the sāmkhya as both of them hold, that there is no entirely new creation nor any utter destruction. There is only unfolding and folding of Nature, dissipation and condensation of natural energy. The process of transformation, therefore, is a process of gradual evolution whereby one order of being arises from another. "The Tao produced one, one produced two, two produced three, three produced all things."

According to some scholars the one was the primary ether, the two refers to the separation of the ether into Yin and Yang constituents, and the three may be interpreted as the production of heaven, earth and man by Yin-Yang ; from them, all other things have been produced. The classical sāmkhya also believes in the process of the gradual and spontaneous unfoldment of different categories from Prakṛti in a similar fashion. Both sāmkhya and the Taoism have discovered order, system and pattern in the evolutionary flow of Nature. Nature is non-divine but it is not a non-living chaos. The sāmkhya believes in the operation of the regulative forces of Nature which prevent the currents of evolution from flowing in a chaotic manner. Just as the Ṭao possesses Teh, in the same manner, Prakṛti also possesses niyāmakas or the regulative forces to cause matter and energy flow in definite patterns. Both the Taoism and the sāmkhya believe that in the process of evolution, the multifarious potentialities of Nature are getting manifested in diverse ways. The effects are of the same nature as the cause. While the sāmkhya says that by knowing the effects, we can know the cause, the Taoists assert that if the Tao is known, everything will be understood, "when the mother is found, we know what her children should be." So, using the terminology of Indian philosophy, we can say that the Taoists of ancient China, too, were (in some sense) the supporters of satkāryavāda.

Scholars of Chinese philosophy generally agree in holding that the Taoism was, originally, profoundly naturalistic and scientific in outlook on life and the world. Immortality, that they longed for, was a material one. The Taoists used to believe in the plurality of souls but their belief was in a sense peculiar. In the opinion of the Taoism, different spirits occupy one and the same body. When death comes, "the little troop of spirits" disperses and so they can not re-assemble into a unity. The body, on the other hand, is a unit and so by means of some special kind of drugs, the body can be preserved and there can be the continuation of a living personality through the medium of an immortal material body. So, there is nothing

like the salvation of the soul of the sāmkhya philosophy : but the atheistic tone of the Taoism nevertheless, gets its counterpart in the philosophy of the classical sāmkhya. The Tao, being the supreme concept, supersedes the need for any other concept. In the Tao Teh Ching (Part I, Chapter IV) Lao Tzu has remarked, "I do not know whose son it (Tao) is, it might appear to have been before God." This proves that according to him, there was nothing before the Tao; the Tao is the highest one In the classical sāmkhya too, no spiritual principle, in the form of God, has been admitted. The sāmkhya kārikā is silent on God whereas the sāmkhya sūtra has said that there is no pramāṇa (i e. means of knowledge) by which the existence of God can be proved.

The assertion of Prakṛti as the primary cause of the evolution of the world and the denial of the causality of the world to any other principle brings the classical sāmkhya close to the teachings of Lao Tzu. Both the sāmkhya and the Taoism were very much interested in Nature and its operation and the Tao has also been spoken of as "the female mystery."

> "The valley spirit dies not, aye the same ;
> The female mystery thus do we name,
> Its gate, from which at first they issued forth
> Is called the root from which grew heaven and earth,
> Long and unbroken does its power remain."

(The valley spirit refers to the activities of the Tao in all the realm of its operation; the female mystery is the Tao which is the mother of all things.)

Thus, we find that the Tao, in Lao Tzu's opinion, refers to the root cause that underlies the changing phenomena of the universe and also to the invariable law of its operation. It is eternal, all pervading, inexhaustible source in its use and the great Mother of Heaven, Earth and Man.

The Taoist text "Khing.Kang King" or "the classic of purity" is supposed to be the work of Ko Yuan, a Taoist of the third

century A. D. In this book, the Tao is not only described as the material substance out of which all things come but it is also supposed to display itself in two forms—Pure and Turbid and has Motion and Rest. It is true that the real implication of the passage is very difficult to grasp : even then we can say that perhaps the sāmkhya conception of Prakṛti as a substance operating in different ways under the influence of the different guṇas might have cast its influence on the Taoist thinkers and might have inspired them to think of the Tao too as an unconscious material substance displaying itself in the two forms of purity and turbidity. In fact, according to sāmkhya also, rajoguṇa, overpowered by the tamo results in stability, whereas tamoguṇa, overpowered by the rajoguṇa assumes the form of movement.* The Historical evidence shows that exchange of thoughts and ideas between China and India started as early as the first century A. D and that a Chinese version of the sāmkhya Kārika was also discovered in China. The same text further, asserts :—

"If one is able to send the desires away, when he looks in at his mind, it is no longer his ; when he looks out at his body, it is no longer him, and when he looks further off at external things, they are things which he has nothing to do."

This idea that purity results in peace and serenity of being and that this can be attained by differentiating one's being from the external things the body and the mind, does remind us of

*The Sāṁkhya has admitted the existence of the three guṇas—sattva, rajas and tamas. Sattva is of the nature of illumination and it results in purity. The Taoist philosophy seems to have assigned the characteristics of sattva-guṇa to rajo : power of illumination and parity seems to constitute the nature of rajo-guṇa described as the form of movement : but motion and the manifestation of motion can never be identical. In this respect the Sāṃkhya occupies a better position than the philosophy of Taoism.

the sāmkhya view of discriminative knowledge. The discriminative knowledge too is acquired by dissociating serene consciousness from the body, sense organs, ego sense and the intellect. The preliminary stage is the removal of desires for worldly objects.

The sāmkhya philosophers were not missionaries ; they never made any attempt to propagate their philosophy in other countries by sending scholars or by establishing monasteries. Due to the absence of the missionary zeal among the sāmkhya philosophers, the philosophy of sāmkhya could not gain so much ground in China as was gained by the buddhistic philosophy although the classical sāmkhya contained many naturalistic elements which could be utilised more effectively by the people of ancient China to build up their own philosophy of Nature.*

**In writing this article the authoress has made use of the English version of the volume "The Texts of Taoism" by J. Legga.*

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RAMANUJA : ITS BASIC PRINCIPLE

Every philosophical system is based on some fundamental principles which are regarded as intuitively certain. In the philosophy of Ramanuja, for example, the existence of the *Cidacidviśiṣṭa Brahman* as the highest Reality that can be known through the Śruti only, is accepted as the fundamental truth to serve as the basic principle. According to the author of the Yatindra Matadipika, Badarayana began his enquiry into the nature of Brahman only on the assumption that the reality lying at the root of the world was no other than the Brahman qualified by Cit and Acit. The existence of such a Brahman can be known only on the authority of the śruti.

The Body-to-Soul Relation

In the philosophy of Ramanuja, the whole world of non-sentient things and sentient beings is assumed in the unity of the Divine personality in a manner in which the individual body is apprehended in the unity of the soul. This body-to-soul relation is the keystone of the philosophy of Ramanuja.

In all his teachings, Ramanuja has remained true to his belief in the organicist character of the Highest Reality and has shown that this conception alone is capable of harmonising different forms of Upasanā as worship of God without any difficulty. Since the body of God is constituted of both spirit and matter and since in ordinary life, we find that the soul enjoys happiness when the body is nursed, even worship of Nature can be regarded as worship of God. By worshipping Prakriti also, one is able to please God who resides in Nature as its indwelling soul. Thus, all forms of Upāsanā, made unto God, parents, preceptors etc. can be legitimately regarded as worship of the one Supreme Divinity although the relative merits of all these forms of worship will be determined according to scriptures.

Ramanuja's Conception of Causation

Since Ramanuja has assumed the reality and eternality of acit as a mode of God, he has upheld pariṇāma-Vāda which is a form of Satkārya-Vāda. The world is not illusory or unreal. It is the real effect of a real cause. The ultimate cause is God who holds cit and acit within Himself as His modes which are, therefore, real. Both cit and acit undergo change of states from the subtle to gross under the supervision of God. The effect is the gross state of the cause and the cause is the subtle state of the effect. The different states are graduality developing from the same causal substance and are deriving their being from it. They are to be regarded as somehow existent in the substance even before their actual development in somewhat new forms. As in Sāmkhya, Ramanuja has admitted the reality of matter. He has, for that reason, accepted the description of the evolution of Nature as expounded in the Sāmkhya philosophy only adding that the entire process of evolution must be taken as being controlled by Brahman. His point of difference is due to the fact that he has accepted the existence of a *Cidacidviśiṣṭa Brahman* as the basic principle of his philosophy and that this has not been favoured by Sāmkhya.

Non-recognition af Avidyā as the Illusory Principle of Objectivity.

Again the acceptance of the reality of acit as a body or mode of God has prevented Ramanuja from accepting any illusory principle of objectivity in the form of Māyā or avidyā. Prakriti, which is a form of acit, prevents the soul from realising its essentially conscious nature ; Prakriti, being unconscious. is naturally opposed to knowledge or vidyā. It is the material cause of the world and is *triguṇātmikā* like the avidyā of Śankara ; but even then Prakriti possesses a status wholly different from the status of the avidyā of Śankara. In the philosophy of advaita, avidyā is a terminable principle and is not metaphysically real. It possesses freedom to put forth appearances only and not to create a real world. The knowledge of Brahman not only reveals the falsity of the given world but it

also implies the falsity of Māyā or avidyā as nothing else can shine before the brilliant light of the advaita Brahman. But the Prakṛti of Ramanuja, though called avidyā in a particular sense, is real and as such it is beginningless and endless. The only speciality about its reality is that it is real as a mode of God from whom alone it derives its substantiality and meaning.

Varṇāśrama actions as the Cause of the Expansion and Contraction of Dharmabhūta Jnāna

In the sphere of Ethics Ramanuja has used the word avidyā in the sense of Varṇāśrama Karma which brings about the expansion and contraction of the Dharmabhūta Jnana of the individual soul. Avidyā in this sense too, is a positive entity, possessing the power of obscuring the attributive knowledge of an individual and creating thereby the false sense of agency in him. The attitude of the individual soul towards the world, therefore, becomes distorted. The individual thinks himself to be the lord of the world and the main purpose of the world seems to him simply to cater to his various needs and comforts. Avidyā in the form of actions, thus, becomes the generating cause of the experience of the individual soul and not of the objects of experience which is Prakriti. Avidyā, in the form of Karma, thus, serves as the principle of obscuration in the philosophy of Ramanuja.

Indeterminate Perception and Qualified Brahman

The unique interpretation of the indeterminate perception which Ramanuja has given is deducible from the basic principle of his philosophy of the highest reality as a qualified being. Since the ultimate cause of the world is qualified, all objects of the world are qualified. Knowledge, therefore, can never be of any object, shorn of all its characteristics. Knowledge always reveals an object as qualified by some of its characteristics. So, Nirvikalpa Perception is not *niṣprakārakaṁ Jñānaṁ kintu prakārasya anuvṛtti rahitaṁ jñānam.*

Liberation

Ramanuja's conception of liberation too follows from his belief in the existence of *Cidacidviśiṣṭa* God as the highest

Reality. For Ramanuja mukti means Videha mukti. It is because Prakriti, as forming the body of God, is real, the body of the embodied soul, being a product of Prakriti, is also real and not false, and because there is a real inseparable relation between the body and the soul, the body-feeling cannot disappear in the living state. So long as the soul remains embodied, its relation with the body is real. It cannot have the feeling of *aśarīram* (i.e. without body)—a feeling without which release from worldly sufferings is not possible.

Conclusion

Thus, the assumption of a qualified Brahman as the highest reality and its organicist relation with cit and acit is the pivotal principle round which all teachings of Ramanuja regarding Jiva and Jagat are revolving in a harmonious way. In the Upanishads and also in the Brahma Sūtra, causality of a spiritual principle and non-difference between the cause and the effect have indeed figured very prominently. Śankara has tried to effect a harmony between these two teachings of the Śruti with the help of his theory of falsity of the world. The Philosophy of Sämkhya, on the other hand, has admitted non-difference between the cause and the effect, but has denied causality to the spirit. It is Ramanuja who has synthesised both the causality of the spirit and the non-difference between the cause and the effect in a realistic manner by introducing the idea that both cit and acit are real as constituting the body of God who is their indwelling principle.

RAMANUJA ON PRAKRITI

Ramanuja has viewed Prakriti as a mode of God, or as the body of the soul and through it of God Himself. As there is body-soul relation between prakṛti and God, Nature is always alive with God who is its innermost ruler. This conception of prakṛti as the body of God or as the mode of God has been formulated by Ramanuja on the ground of both scriptural evidence and reason.

Scriptural Evidence

The chand-upaniṣad declares : *"ākāśo vai nāmarūpayonirvahitā te yadantarā tadbrahma" 8/14/1.* That is to say, Brahman which is of the form of *ākāśa* is the creator of *nānarūpa* or the psycho-physical world of the gross form. Brahman exists in the innermost core of the universe as its *paramātman.* Taittīriya Āraṇyaka says : *"antaḥ praviṣṭaḥ śāstā janānām sarvātmā."* 3. 10. 10. That is to say, the indwelling spirit of everything, is God qualified by *cit* and *acit.* The Bṛhad.-upaniṣad declares : *"Yaḥ pṛthivyām tiṣṭhan. yasya prthivī śarīram, yaḥ prithivim antarayamayati* : yaḥ ātmani tiṣṭhan.. yasyātmā śarīram etc. : 3.7.3...22. That is to say, Brahman is the indwelling spirit of the earth which constitutes its body. Brahman is also the inner controller of the earth. The soul, too, is the body of Brahman : Brahman resides in the soul as the inner controller etc.

In the Viṣṇupurāṇa, it has been stated that the whole world represents a dynamic power of God : (*akṣaram tatparambrahma kṣaram sarvamidam jugat..parasya brahmanaḥ saktistathedam—akhilam jagat* : 1/22/55,56. Thus, prakṛti being the body of God or power of God is moved into all its transformations by God Himself. The primeval causal entity possessing three different types of qualities in the forms of *sattva, rajas* and *tamas* is not, therefore, an independent category like the prakṛti of the sāmkhya school. It is wholly controlled by God who

is its sole ruler and refuge. Prakṛti is a body as well as a mode of God. When nature is moved into a manifested condition, we have the state of creation and when God withholds Prakṛti from transformations, we have the state of dissolution. Creation and dissolution are two different states of prakṛti brought about by God Himself.

Reason

Reason also speaks in favour of this theory as it seeks to bring about a satisfactory reconciliation between realism and idealism. Realism in its anxious attempt to free object from its dependence on thought, ultimately develops the abortive tendency of reducing consciousness or thought to things or objects. Similarly, idealism by reducing things to thoughts and viewing reality as an intellectual construction, tends towards subjectivism and solipsism. Ramanuja, by recognising thinker and the object of thought as eternal modes of God, has corrected the defects of realism and idealism : he has also shown a satisfactory method of bridging over the gulf between spirit and matter which is ordinarily created by dualistic systems.

Prakṛti as conceived by Ramanuja :

When Ramanuja has described prakṛti as the body of God, he has not used the word "body" in the ordinary sense of the *bhogāyatana* of a *jīva*. Prakṛti constitutes the body of God since it is a substance which is wholly dependent on God and is also subservient to Him in every sense. Nature is guided and controlled by God, and serves the purpose and the ideal which are inherent in the nature of God. In other words, prakṛti derives its meaning and sustenance wholly from its Lord. As body of God, prakṛti is both different and non-different from Him. The feeling of non-difference is due to the relation of *aprithaksiddhi* that exists between Nature and God.

Prakṛti is, however, the changeable matrix of the world. It passes through different stages thereby creating different transformations. In the philosophy of Ramanuja, prakṛti is a substance possessing *sattva, rajas* and *tamas* as qualities. It is

not an equilibriated state of three types of subtle substances like *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. Here at every stage of evolution, prakṛti is moved by God and it is through the will of God that she acquires new characteristics in the different evolutionary stages. It is due to its association with prakṛti that a worldly soul is deprived of its natural knowledge and bliss and is made to suffer miserably in this empirical life. Prakṛti for that reason is called *avidyā*. It is also called *māyā* as it brings into existence enormous diversities and differences.

Prakṛti is essentially dynamic—a perpetual flux without any stagnation anywhere. For this reason, Prakṛti has been described as *asat* in the *śruti*. The word *asat* implies (in regard to prakṛti) instability, dynamism and indeterminate nature and not illusoriness. Prakṛti has been called *anitya* in the same sense. The word "nāsti" also refers to this essentially mutative nature of prakṛti. In the causal state, prakṛti is subtle and undifferentiated ; but in the effect-state, it evolves itself into many varieties of names and forms constituting the empirical world. Prakṛti in the subtle state is called *mūla prakṛti* and *mūla* prakṛti is not of any practical use. It is because *mūla Prakriti* always remains in the subtle and undifferentiated form that it is called *tamaḥ* or *avyakta*. When prakṛti reaches the creative stage, it is called *kṣara* because of its constant changes into various gross forms.

Although the three qualities of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* are separately mentioned, yet they do not preserve their independent existence when they get mixed up in the form of a particular object. Their existence can be inferred only on the evidence of their effects.

Causalty of Prakṛti

Though Ramanuja has recognised prakṛti as the mutable material cause of the universe, thereby holding a view similar to that of the sāmkhya, still in one important point Rāmānuja differs wholly from the view of the sāmkhya school. The classical

śāṁkhya holds that prakṛti is wholly independent and is not guided or controlled in her evolutionary process by any spiritual principle. It is the nature of prakṛti to change in the form of this world and it is doing so quite automatically like the spontaneous flow of milk from the udders of the cow. Prakṛti possesses unconscious teleology as a result of which it can carry on the processes of evolution and dissolution independently. The way in which unconscious prakṛti has been equipped with all forces and laws, necessary for creating the universe, however, logically suggests a mechanistic interpretation of the world. The concept of unconscious teleology, introduced to emphasise the fact that the evolutionary process is moving towards a final goal, i.e. the goal of the spirit, does not make any appreciable improvement in the sāmkhya position. Teleological movement inherent in an unconscious but absolutely independent principle is inconceivable. If it is further said that it is not a wholly unconscious nature but a *cetanāvīṣṭā prakṛti* that creates the world for the benefit of the living beings then also the teleological movement of prakṛti will have to be explained as the result of the infusion of consciousness into it. Moreover, if the cause is wholly unconscious and wholly independent of a spiritual principle, then the effect of such a cause will never be the result of an inner growth of the cause planned and willed by a conscious being to fit into the scheme of this world of living beings. Under such circumstances, the effect will simply be a sequential condition appearing after the appearances of its invariable and unconditional causal state. We shall therefore be left with three *guṇas* moving according to their own laws of motion almost in a mechanical way and making the world a disenchanted world of the modern mechanical science of physics : the world will, indeed, be a world robbed of all its charms and fascinations. These difficulties have been fully removed by Ramanuja. For Ramanuja, causal relation means inner growth and spiritual development. Prakṛti is controlled and made to yield different products by God who is the inner self of all living beings and non-living things.

The universe is rooted in God and pulsates with His life. Change and diversities of Nature are so created as to adopt themselves to the spiritual progress of the *jivas*. Perfection of individual souls is the real purpose of the process of evolution. The will of God is the primary cause that produces changes in nature and progress in individual souls. It is by knowing Him as the inner self of both *cit* and *acit* that everything else is known. Real cause, therefore, is the Divine urge that creates a universe—the goal and foundation of which are Brahman itself. This is real teleology, as it refers to God and not to an independent prakṛti as the final cause of all things and beings of the world.*

---

* The author has written a comprehensive work entitled "*A critical study of the philosophy of Ramanuja*". In this work her treatment of the Ramanuja's epistemology as compared with other realistic schools in India is specially praiseworthy. The book has been published by Messrs Chowkhamba Sanskrit series Office, Varanasi. (Rs. 25/). —*Editor.*

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND LIFE

This is the age of atomic energy. The rapid progress of science, in all walks of life, has stimulated the egoistic confidence of human beings to such an extent that they are, now, unwilling to admit the existence of any higher spiritual power in the form of God. A keen fight between Science and Philosophy or between Philosophy and Religion is constantly in evidence. Scientifically oriented minds, nowadays, turn a deaf ear to philosophical and religious teachings. Of course in this fight, Philosophy is sometimes treated with sympathy and consideration, but Religion has not had the fortune of listening to sweet words of endearment from the staunch followers of Modern Science.

The followers of materialistic science describe religion as opium for the common man. Religion, in their opinion, acts like poison and life-destroying medicine so far as common people are concerned. The rich people are always exploiting the common man in the name of Religion. So, if common people are to be saved, Religion should be banished from the human society. This is the attitude of the present day world. This anti-philosophical and anti-religious attitude of human beings is, however, not beneficial for the all-round progress of human life. In fact, it is the immortal teachings of Philosophy and Religion that can help human beings to have a taste of the Life Infinite and can also endow them with all the excellences befitting human mind.

Material Happiness

Science can, no doubt, help man to increase the creature comforts of life. Scientific achievements have increased largely the material happiness and prosperity of mankind. Science really opens up for human beings the realm of material enjoyment (preyajagat).

Desires for material gain and material prosperity are the spontaneous upsurges of the animal nature of man. These desires can be fulfilled to a certain extent by the Science. But then the question arises, tataḥ kim, what does this satisfaction finally lead to ? Does a human being enjoy eternal peace by running after the fleeting objects of the changing world ? The answer is negative in the words of Manu "Na Jatu Kāmaḥ Kāmānāmūpabhogena Śāmyati" (Desires cannot be stopped by enjoyment). Enjoyment which lacks the spirit of sacrifice can never deliver real good to human society. It is the man, who, while enjoying, also thinks of others and takes into consideration the benefit and happiness of others, can work truly for the enhancement of the total good of his society. It is due to this fact that the philosophers of our country have made aparigraha the foundation stone of Indian social life and culture. In the negative aspect, aparigraha implies giving up the spirit of selfish monopoly after realising the evil that results from such greed. In the positive sense, on the other hand, it means giving every man what is his due and also administering justice to all in a spirit of Love and Sacrifice. In other words, aparigraha means renunciation of the ego-centric attitude of life which is always in conflict with social life and social good. One who possesses the spirit of aparigraha, also possesses all the excellences of human mind and such a man really becomes the asset of human society. Now, the annihilation of the ego-centric attitude can never be brought about by scientific progress. Scientific achievements which increase personal comforts, really strengthen the ego-centric attitude of a human being and encourage him to think that the world is meant for his own enjoyment only. What do we visualise in the present day world ? Do we not find that due to the strengthening of narrow egoism, people have lost sight of real and permanent peace ? Physical comforts of human beings have increased, no doubt, but there is definite loss of mental peace and balance. Peace can be perceived nowhere—neither in the life of the society, nor in the life of the state.

Now, cultivation of the spirit of aparigraha or annihilation of the narrow egohood is possible only if we turn our eyes to philosophy and religion and seek to churn out the man-making or soul-making devices from their bosoms. Mere scientific knowledge cannot awaken moral excellences in man; and when devoid of moral excellences, man ceases to be a man in the true sense of the term. In fact, the present day crisis in the national and international fields, is mainly due to the lack of human excellences in man. Man is not only a rational and social animal, he is also a moral being and it is because he is a moral being that he is able to build up a social life based on mutual love, mutual respect and sacrifice for mutual good. The main aim of man should, therefore, be a movement not only towards a scientific knowledge that aims at revealing the secrets of nature and life, but also towards the philosophical and religious knowledge of the true nature of man as a moral and spiritual being.

What I have stated above, does not, however, mean that Indian Philosophy teaches anti-materialism. In fact, Indians also do not admit an absolute separation between the material and the spiritual. Material happiness and comforts are, no doubt, necessary, but they are of an inferior value. The highest value lies in the realisation of the ethico-metaphysical being of man. Life begins in a material world and this world does charm a man, nourish him and provide him with all the material necessities of life. The spiritual being remains wrapped up in a material covering—a covering to which we have got to give some importance. Here, Science comes to our aid : but man has also got to realise his inner essence as moral and spiritual being without which he will not be able to occupy a higher and more dignified position on earth than the lower animals. This realisation, a man can attain only through Philosophy and Religion. Hence, if man has got to live as man, he can never do without Philosophy and Religion.

Origin of Philosophy and Religion according to Indian view and their relation to human-life

Whenever we reflect on the nature of the world, we find that

nothing here abides or endures forever. All things and beings of the world are subject to birth, decrease, increase, change, decay and death. There is not a single worldly thing that bears the stamp of eternity. The darkness of the night is dispelled completely by the radiant glow of the morning sun, but as soon as the sun sets in the evening, there is the re-appearance of the nocturnal darkness. The rose plant, first of all, puts forth leaves, then buds and then the brilliantly hued flower. The wonderful odour of the flower delights the heart of many people. But how long does this delightful object last ? Only for a very short period. The petals of the flower wither away within a short period of time and all the glory and brightness of the flower become dust and ashes in a second.

This changing aspect of the world has stirred the human mind from the very first day of human existence and has made him restless, searching and meditative. The questions generally asked are :

Why are the things of the world subject to decay and death ? Where from do these things come into existence and where do they go when they are destroyed ? Is there any invisible power or invisible being that causes constant changes in the world ? Is this invisible being the source and the merging place of all worldly objects ?

It is this sort of quest that lies at the root of all philosophical and religious thinking. In fact, this type of query is the origin of Philosophy and Religion.

Man realises that his love for happiness and freedom is spontaneous and natural. He cannot stand sorrows and disappointments which always create an attitude of aversion in him. No doubt, he has to obey the laws of Nature but he always shows intense eagerness for freedom from the shackles of Nature. Despair, sorrow and frustration result in a feeling of imperfection and helplessnes which torment human minds. Happiness, on the other hand, is always the sign of perfection

and a source of hope and optimism. Where there is happiness, there is the feeling of completeness and perfection. The primary motive of a human being is, therefore, to find out the ultimate source of happiness and freedom which will enable him to free himself from the state of subjection to Natural powers. It is because of this fact that Philosophy and Religion which are nothing but the quest of Truth, bliss and freedom, are very intimately connected with human-life. The human-life is regulated mainly by the intellect and the feelings and emotions—by knowledge and love and these forces are nourished and cultivated through Philosophy and Religion. The thorough and proper cultivation of the intellect makes a man conscious of the infinite nature of knowledge and a progressive culture of nobler emotions enables him to taste the inexplicable sweetness and happiness of Infinite Love and emotion.

Love eternal or bliss infinite is one with infinite and eternal knowledge. As soon as the intellect is enriched with the knowledge of the infinite and the eternal, the human heart melts quickly with love for all creation. He, then, forgets his narrow egoism, forgets all differences between man and man and feels an intense urge to do good to all, to be the friend of all, to be the living emblem of universal love and fellowship with all mankind. In other words, the stream of knowledge mingles with the stream of love and creates the sacred confluence of human-life. Both Philosophy and Religion deal with that aspect of human-life in which pure knowledge and pure love flow spontaneously in abundance. That aspect of human-life which manifests its infinity and greatness in knowledge, love and action, bears the stamp of true manhood according to both Philosophy and Religion. According to Indian Philosophy, the true being of man consists of sat, cit and ananda and according to Indian Religion, the true being of man is nothing but a part of the Divine Being endowed with infinite auspicious qualities. Man is essentially Divine in nature—this is what Indian Religion teaches. Man is essentially non-attached and pure consciousness—this is

what Indian Philosophy teaches. In fact, a true philosopher is also a truly religious man. The Gita says :—

Vītarāgabhayakrodhā
manmayā mānupāśṛtāḥ
Vahabo Jnānatapasā Pūtā
madbhāvamāgatāḥ

In India, the purpose of Religion is to awaken in man his true, good and loving nature whereas the purpose of Philosophy is to make him perfect in all respects and truly wise. It would, therefore, appear that both Philosophy and Religion have similar approach so far as glorification of human life is concerned.

When by knowledge, the philosopher realises his oneness with the Life Infinite, the soul becomes the object of love and devotion for him ; In this stage, the mind of the wise man becomes permeated with Infinite Love and goodwill for all. Just as God is the object of love for a devotee, in the same manner, the soul becomes the object of love for a wise man.

God is not only the object of love for the devotee, He is also of the nature of Infinite Love. The soul, for a wise man too, is of the form of love. In the Pancadasi, it has been stated "Yat ānanda rūpo na bhavati sa niratiśaya premaviṣayo na bhavati". There is no difference between pure love and pure knowledge. The feeling of unity which the wise seeks to realise through knowledge, the devotee seeks to realise through love and adoration. It is only when both the intellect and emotion are equally purified and made perfect that infinite knowledge and infinite love flood the mind of a wise man or of a devotee of God. If with an increase in knowledge, there is no corresponding expansion of the human heart or if with an expansion of the human heart there is no corresponding increase in human knowledge then nobody can have the feeling of completeness in him. Both knowledge and love are necessary to make buddhi purely

sāttvika in nature. Sattva guṇa is of the nature of knowledge and also of the nature of happiness and love. So, if buddhi becomes sāttvika in nature, then there is not only the awakening of knowledge in the intellect, there is also the awakening of love and good will in the heart of a man. It is through Philosophy and Religion that knowledge and love can be properly cultivated and the life of a human being can be morally regenerated and spiritually divinised. The Indian Philosophical tradition holds that human knowledge can be complete and perfect only when the human being feels the pulsation of the Life Infinite in and through each atom and molecule of the wonderful world. He also feels his identity with the Infinite Life, nay, with the whole of creation. The wise feels the existence of the Life Divine in his own body and mind, in the bodies and minds of other human beings, in the bodies of the insects, in plants and trees, in rivers and the mountains. So, the whole world becomes the "Sva' of the wise man. The infinite is realised through the finite, the mortal through the immortal. Since the wise man transcends all distinctions and differences in knowledge, he does not differentiate between man and man on the basis of caste, creed and sex. Men and animals, low and high, are the same in his eyes. He has then a broader and higher vision of man and the universe. Philosophy, thus, teaches human beings to cultivate this broader vision of life if not fully, at least partially. This is because one who develops such a noble vision gives up fully the spirit of selfishness with the result that he does not feel any difficulty either in giving everyman what is his due or in administering justice to all in a spirit of love and service. Indeed, it is the desire for selfish gain that acts as a violent force of social disintegration and prevents man from living the life of noble and the peaceful co-existence. Hence, if human beings sincerely desire to live in peace and harmony, they should try to cultivate such a broad outlook which can result only from such philosophical knowledge.

Religion, on the other hand, enables a man to develop such

a broad outlook on life and the universe through love and devotion. In the eyes of the devotee, the whole world is a finite and non-eternal manifestation of the Infinite grandeur and richness of an eternal God.

Ekaikam jātam vahudha
vikurvan
Asmin kṣetre saṁ carati eṣa
devaḥ
In the eyes of the devotee,
Eko hi rudraḥ na dvitiyāya
tasthuḥ
Ya imān locān īśate iśnibhiḥ

Even the smallest insect of the world manifests divinity through its being

Pūrṇamadaḥ pūrṇamidaṁ
Pūrṇāt pūrṇamuadcyate
Pūrṇasya pūrṇamādāya
Pūrṇame vāvaśi ṣyate.

To feel the existence of God in all sights and sounds, things and beings of the world is what is spoken of as love or devotion. The devotee feels intensely his brotherhood with the whole of creation and this feeling helps him to transcend the narrow egoistic limit of animal existence. It also enriches him with all the excellences of human mind. Thus, both Philosophy and Religion are intimately related to human life in the sense that these two alone aim at making man a true human being, a true representative of the Life Divine.

Quest for Supreme

In India, Religion and Philosophy are not treated separately. Both occupy an important place in human-life. All intellectual or philosophical speculations have an important bearing on practical life. The betterment of life or spiritual regeneration forms the ideal of both, Philosophy and Religion, in India. In both, we find an infinite quest for the supreme of human-life. Darshana or seeing melts into being. To see the truth is

to believe it, and to believe the truth is to be the truth. Thus Philosophy or Darshana is naturally transformed into Religion.

Further, religious teachings can be accepted under two circumstances :—

(1) In the state of knowledge.
(2) In the state of ignorance.

In the state of knowledge, a man becomes conscious of the result that will accrue to him from the religious practices, he also reflects on them, considers and evaluates them and then embraces the religion and practises it seriously and sincerely.

Now, reflection, consideration, evaluation etc. constitute Philosophical thinking and hence in the state of knowledge philosophical reflection finds a very important place in religious thought of a man. Whenever an event or an object happens to take place in practical life, we become acquainted with its apparent changes. But beyond these apparent changes, there is a final culmination. Philosophical quest starts with the apparent changes so as to reach the final stage. A wise devotee practises religious rites but at the same time he also reflects on the final results of such practices. In other words, in the life of a wise devotee, philosophical reflection occupies a very important place. In the case of an ignorant devotee, such philosophical reflection is not, however, possible ; but philosophical matter is still present in his religious thinking. He listens to ethical discourses, remembers God through hymns and divine songs and also becomes eager to do good to the human society. It is only the philosophical reflection about all these things that is not prominent in his mind. Hence, it is evident that Religion can never be divorced totally from Philosophy.

Religious Rites

In truth, those religious rites which aim at human well-being, those moral practices which lead man to his final goal and make him eager for attaining liberation, have philosophical

thinking at their root. Truly speaking, philosophy is intimately related to every branch of knowledge that helps a man attain human excellences. This is because liberation or peace, which is the goal of philosophy can be obtained only when a man develops all human excellences in him ; because of this reason, Philosophical sādhanā, in all countries is nothing but a discipline which one has to undergo thoroughly for the purpose of attaining human excellences.

According to materialistic sciences, there is no other entity apart from the body ; but unless we admit the existence of a blissful and infinite soul enlightening material bodies, we do not feel inspired. The human mind has a natural desire for the life infinite. Hence, both Philosophy and Religion are essential for human life, as otherwise, human beings will not be able to have a taste of the Life Infinite which requires prior attainment of human values. Where the society is not built up with a spiritualistic outlook on life, peace is still far off. There is not even good will between state and state. When we reflect on the present day world and its conflicts, contradictions and degeneration, we feel sincerely that human excellences cannot be fully manifested in a materialistic society. So long as the materialistic outlook of the modern society is not replaced by the spiritualistic thinking, there is no hope for moral regeneration of man and establishment of permanent peace. It is, indeed, a hope against hope to think that man can establish peace in the world even after banishing Philosophy and Religion from his life.

METAPHYSICAL BASIS OF INDIAN SOCIAL THOUGHT

As is well known, India possesses a vast literature of śāstras where man has become the subject matter of study both as an individual and as a member of the society. These śâstras have specialised themselves in different social fields. In this paper, I shall particularly confine our discussion to the Upaniṣads, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata & Manusmṛti.*

There is a general belief that ancient Indian thinkers have kept themselves engaged with the transcendental and other-worldly things only, and that the people of ancient India have adopted only an attitude of over-spiritualism which results naturally in world-condemnation.

If we deeply go into the spirit of Indian culture, we shall find that this impression is not correct, because India has never neglected the positive background of human life. As a matter of fact, Indian thinkers have tried to impress upon the people the usefulness of the educational system, social ethics and good political organisation, as these are the medium through which human beings can reach the highest goal of life which can be called, self-realisation or liberation. The transcendental life or the life divine is being continuously displayed through the positive, the secular and the material. So, the positive, the secular and the material can never be sacrificed for the quest of the life beyond. What India has been really trying is to forge synthesis between the positive and the transcendental, the worldly and the other-worldly, metaphysics and social science. The positive aspects of life, however, are subordinated to the transcendental life. The metaphysical knowledge or *tattvajñāna*, which helps a man to reach the goal of life is *parāvidyā ;* all other *vidyās.* which are based on the metaphysical truth are *aparāvidyā.*

Pure consciousness, which constitutes the real being of an individual, is manifested through the mind-body system. The

body and the organs are the necessary instruments by which the individual soul can have its inherent perfection unfolded.

The embodied soul appears in a particular environment and it has to become related to other embodied souls for the satisfaction of its various psychophysical needs. The social life of individuals is built on the basis of these relations. It is in a well-organized society only that a man can get the chance of attaining excellences of character which will make him fit for undertaking his journey up the hill of his true being. Hence, in India, the society was based on some such principles which would always help a man to attain his spiritual perfection.

The Upaniṣads :

Monistic spiritualism or advaita Brahmavāda is generally admitted as the central teaching of the Upaniṣads. The social thought of the Upaniṣadic age, is, therefore, based on *adhyātmavāda.* The Upaniṣadic sages have not regarded the world as *tucchɨ.* There is no world-condemnation in the Upaniṣads. The world is to be looked upon as essential and lovable because the world is based on truth. The Upaniṣads have taught us to respect the world, to respect the relations that exist between man and man, in this world, to love all, to respect all, to give up the habit of hankering after the wealth or property of other people, to perform all duties relative to different varṇas and āśramas, to speak the truth, to live for a full hundred years by doing good deeds so that the society can prosper and produce more and more good for the benefit of its members. The system of education, described in the Upaniṣads, is a form of domestic system. Under this system, the students have to live in the house of the teacher. The society of the Upaniṣadic age, consists of four classes. Education is absolutely necessary for the members of the first three classes. When education is completed, the *snātaka* becomes a householder as he has got to perform all his family duties and social duties in the best possible manner for his own spiritual betterment. Family, society etc. are the institutions through which expansion of the soul is to be felt.

The social life or the organized life of the people is to be grounded on *satya*, *tyāga* or *aparigraha*, *saṁyama*. *ahiṁsā* and *kartavyabhāvanā* or devotion to duties. These should constitute the foundation stone of the social life because these socio-ethical values are closely interlinked, with the spiritual value which is *śānti* or liberation. In fact, *mokṣa* is nothing but the final flowering of these human excellences. There can be no well organized social life unless the members are willing to sacrifice personal benefits for the good of all. In a good society, no individual is allowed unrestrained liberty to satisfy his limitless greed. Those who can never sacrifice *svakalyāṇa buddhi* for the good of all, can never have a peaceful social life.

In India, these humanitarian principles have always been regarded as the basic principles of any human organisation. The Upaniṣads have described human beings as limited expressions of an immeasurable Brahman. Both world and man are parts of the creation through which Saccidānanda is manifesting itself in thousands of forms. It is because man is a part of nature that he appears on the world-stage in the form of a mixed category which contains both consciousness and jiva-saṁskāras. Due to the presence of the thick layer constituted of these *prākṛtika* elements, his real and eternal *svarūpa* remains covered and hidden. The soul which is, by nature, devoid of all pravṛttis falsely appears to display an inclination towards worldly enjoyment. Desires too, appear falsely to arise in the soul which is, by nature, desireless. The impure prākṛtic elements should be removed, if the real nature of the soul is to be realized. Now, purity of the *citta* can be attained by the acquisition of socio-ethical virtues which have been described by Patañjali as akliṣṭavṛttis of the *citta*; and the cultivation of these excellences of the mind is possible only in a well organized society. Saccidānanda is realized through *niṣkāma karma śuddha jñāna* and *śuddha prema*.

The Rāmāyaṇa.

The similar attitude towards social life and social thinking is expressed in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, In the *Rāmāyaṇa*

Valmiki, the great sage, hns beautifully idealised the different kinds of social relations which exist between man and man as members of a social unit. In this epic, we see the pictures of the ideal king, the ideal son, the ideal brother, the ideal wife and the ideal servant. We also see a very charming picture of the undivided loyalty and devotion which spontaneously flood the hearts of the subjects when they are ruled by an able and affectionate king. The character of each one of these ideal personalities displays in abundance, the moral excellences in the forms of *aparigraha*, *saṁyama satya* love, devotion and dutifulness. If we are to reach the goal of life, then it should be our foremost duty to purify our minds by acquiring human excellences through all our social relations. We should know fully how we should conduct ourselves towards our relatives, friends, superiors and subordinates.

While describing the city of Ayodhyā, Vālmiki also mentions the moral qualities which a king should possess, if the king wishes to be loved by his subjects. The poet says "Just as the highly glorious Manu protected the whole world, so did king Daśaratha. The king, who was true to his word, and who was engaged in the pursuit of wealth, religious merit and sense enjoyment, protected the foremost city of Ayodhyā in the same way as Indra protected Amarāvāti. The people of that city are happy, virtuous, free from greed, truthful and contented with their own fortune. There is no householder who has not stored valuable things. All the men and women of the city are virtuous, well regulated in life, cheerful and faultless in character." The above facts, are evidences to prove that in India, the duty of the king does not end by increasing merely the material prosperity of the people. The king should also look after the well-being of his subjects. The people should not be morally crippled because moral bankruptcy will not only deprive them of the benefits of a well-regulated social life, but will also prevent them from reaching the real goal of life which is *Svarūpa sākṣātkāra*.

The everyday life of the human society should not, therefore,

be despised or ignored in any manner. On the other hand, the social life should be so constituted that in and through the ordinary vibrations of the empirical life, a preparation for tasting the bliss of the Life Infinite is continuously carried on. A successful king is one who is able to remove conflicts between the society and the individual by adopting sound social measure.

Mahābhārata and the Manusmṛti

In the *Mahābhārata* also, we find the same positive attitude towards social life which is the preparatory stage for man-making or soul-making. The problems of the social life are to be dealt with with due deliberation and caution because the social life will help a man to acquire all socio-moral virtues which will finally culminate in liberation. How the social order can be best maintained, has been explained by Bhiṣma to Yudhiṣthira in the *Rajadharmaparva* of the *Mahābhārata*. Bhiṣma has said that the foremost duty of the king is to protect his people and not to run away to the forest to embrace *sannyāsa*. The king should have recourse to punishment (when necessary) to guide people to the proper course of conduct The king should be learned, virtuous, self-controlled and should be powerful enough to have full control over his people. In social-life, even truth and false-hood have sometimes been viewed from the standpoints of the effects they produce on social good. On some occasions, even truth-telling should be avoided if it produces evil and not good. Thus, the social outlook in the *Mahābhārata*, is essentially humanitarian as the social ideal is to awaken in man all human excellences which will make him fit for the realisation of his own infinity and bliss. It is only when a man attains moral qualities that his mind is elevated to a higher level, and in that elevated state of consciousness, is realised the infinite being of an embodied soul. When an individual sacrifices his own selfish tendencies, he becomes free from the clutches of his narrow egoism He, then, develops the spiritual capacity of treating all on an equal footing. It is in this level of consciousness, that the individual soul is capable of going beyond his *prākṛta sattā* or limited being. The feeling of oneness with the world does not, how-

ever, mean the feeling of identity with the world of human beings only. There is life in the vegetable, in the insects, in the lower animals and in the so-called *sthāvara* objects as well. The expanded self, therefore, covers both spirit and matter, ego and non-ego, as both of them are the manifestations of the original self. Hence, in India, the social thought, does not refer to the unfoldment of all human excellences only as the final goal of life; the *summum bonum* of life is the manifestation of the real form of *ātman*. It is because of this spiritual basis of the social life that in India, a man is not supposed to attain perfection by performing the duties of a house-holder only. The virtues like *tyāga, saṁyama, ahimsa, satya* etc. start blossoming in the heart of a man who has entered into the stage of a house-holder; but these virtues can flower in final liberation only if they are cultivated with single-minded devotion which is not to be had in the humdrum of the worldly life. Hence, the two āsramas., namely *vānaprastha* and *sannyāsa* have been added to the first two āśramas of *Brahmacharya* and *gārhastya*. In the stages of *vānaprastha* and *sannyāsa* the *yati* gives up even the pious desires for enjoying the fruits of good deeds. The result is that the mind of a *yati* becomes wholly disinterested in all things of the world. This is the state of calmness and mental balance. The *yati* gives up completely the feelings of "I" and "mine" and thereby reaches a stage where he can taste the bliss of eternal life.

yadābhāvena bhavati sarvabhāveṣu nispṛhaḥ
tadā sukhamavāpnoti pretya ceha ca śāśvatam.
indriyāṇām nirodhena rāgadveṣakṣayeṇa ca
ahiṁsayā ca bhūtānām amṛtatvāya kalpate.

Manu : Chapter 6.

The virtue of *aparigraha* which leads to *paravairāgya* and pure knowledge should become deep rooted in the mind of a *yati* by constant practice. The *yati* should collect alms once only in a day.

ekakālam caredbhaikṣam na prasajjeta vistare
bhaikṣe prasakto hi yatir viṣayeṣvapi sajjate

Manu : Chapter 6

In the *Manusmṛti*, therefore, we find that social good has been harmonised with the transcendental good. How the social life is to be formed, what should be the duties of the different classes of men, what should be the means of living of the different varṇas, what should be the forms of marriage, how property is to be inherited etc. are the various topics discussed in the *Manusmṛti* : but all these duties refer to a common end i.e., the purification of the mind. A purified mind alone is capable of realising its oneness with the whole universe. By performing all social duties in a proper spirit, one can destroy one's narrow egoism which is the most powerful knot of our empirical life. The sense of duty always carries with it a sincere desire to serve others whereas the consciousness of right remains associated with the sense of possession which strengthens our selfish ego-sense. Man cannot realise his identity with the whole universe unless this narrow ego-sense is wholly uprooted. When we perform our duties in a proper spirit, we relate ourselves and the things in our possession to some other person as the objects of his own possession. Hence, our social thinkers have laid particular stress on the performance of duties and not on the assertion of rights. Rights are, however, not neglected. Duty and right are mutually related. What is a right in the case of one is a duty in the case of another. The right of the subject is the duty of the king. If everybody discharges his duties properly, rights will automatically be preserved. By performing duties in a proper manner, we shall be able to transcend the narrow limit imposed on us by *prakṛti* ; this will enable us to enjoy the immortal bliss of the life Divine. Hence, in the opinion of Indian thinkers, the social life should be sanctified by *brahmānubhūti*. Enjoyment with the spirit of selflessness (*tyāgaviddhabhoga*) which has been referred to in the *Iśopaniṣad* by the words '*tyaktena bhunjithāḥ*' is the enjoyment of the highest type. Indian thinkers do not preach and teach *netivāda* as is generally believed ; but they proclaim the glory of *aparigraha* or renunciation of the selfish motive without which no human organisation can thrive properly. In the family life as well as in the life of the society, enjoyment should always be sought with

spirit of selflessness, sacrifice and detachment. If enjoyment is sought for the sake of selfish satisfaction only, then this form of enjoyment will produce nothing but greed, hatred and *himsā* which always act as forces of disruption in an organized life. Hence, the rishis of our country have always advised people to effect a happy union between *bhoga* and *tyāga* (i.e., enjoyment and renunciation of selfish motive). It is the beauty and bliss of Saccidānanda which is to be enjoyed by us in and through all relations which exist between man and man and also between man and the world.

Concluding Remarks :

The attitude of '*tyaktena bhuñjithāḥ*' does not, however, advise us to embrace asceticism. We are only to enjoy worldly pleasure after giving up the spirit of selfishness. If a man gives up the spirit of selfish enjoyment, he feels no difficulty either in giving every man what is his due or in administering justice to all in a spirit of love and service. The coupling of 'enjoyment' with the spirit of 'self-sacrifice' is a truth, the eternal value of which can be denied by no person. The cultivation of the spirit of sacrifice will always produce good effects in the organized life of all forms in all ages. Similar is the case with *satya*, *ahimsā* etc. In this age of science also, the value of *satya aparigraha*, *saṁyama* and *ahimsā* cannot be minimised. The ultimate goal of life is, no doubt, attainment of *śānti* or liberation, but *śānti* can be attained only when one has acquired human excellences by performing his social duties in a spirit of selfless service. One should, first of all, attain perfection as a man and then only he will be in a position to become Brahman. It is only a man who can attain liberation.

The Indian scriptures have, no doubt, praised, *mokṣa* in laudable words : this is because *śānti* or peace is needed in every form of corporate life. A society cannot increase *artha* and *kāma* without creating a peaceful atmosphere.

Even in Kāmaśāstra, *abhyudaya* and *niḥśreyasa* have been described as the final goal of life. This does not mean that there can be no liberation without the practice of *kāma*. On

the other hand, it means that one who enjoys *kāma* but keeps his mind fixed on śânti, can enjoy kâma properly and can also desist from sensual enjoyment when necessary ; But the man who indulges in sensual enjoyment for its own sake becomes a debauchee and can never experience *śānti* in his life. His mind is always burning with passions.

Further, we are advised by the sages of our country to perform our actions with full knowledge of the end which we wish to obtain. The end which we want to obtain is the development of human excellences in the forms of *ahiṁsā, satya, tyāga, saṁyama*, etc. If the members of a society act with full knowledge of these precious things of life, there will be no disorder in the society which will automatically become more and more integrated. Such is the social thought of India based on the metaphysical truth of *advitīya ātmavāda.* The socio-moral values, prescribed by the sages of India, are such that they are to be practised in every form of social life. Even the people of a state with a materialistic outlook will have to adhere to *satya, saṁyama*, etc. in all human dealings as otherwise, the state of their choice will not survive for a long time. It is due to this fact that India is regarded as the torchbearer of human civilisation. In the midst of the present day world crisis, it is, therefore, the imperative duty of every philosopher to bring to the notice of the world, these fundamental human values, the cultivation of which has become absolutely necessary for the preservation of world-peace.

PHILOSOPHY FOR A FULLER LIFE

Many faiths and philosophies have flourished in India with the common object of helping us to know what the significance of a full and perfect life really is. It was the firm belief of ancient Indian sages that the philosophy of Dharma based on the upasnisadic spiritualism could enable one to enjoy fulness of life both from the worldly and the religious points of view.

Dharma is a term which embraces the life of an individual in all its aspects. Social duties, social virtues, moral excellences, laws, administration of socio-political institutions, the socio-political relations of different types, are all encompassed by Dharma. Enjoyment of material objects (artha), enjoyment of family happiness (kāma) and the enjoyment of peace emanating from self-realisation (mokṣa) are to be rooted in Dharma. Since the philosophy of Dharma is intimately related to social and moral life, this seems to be the one that can very well bring about an all round development of human life.

One who desires to attain fullness in the worldly sense can do so by grounding his worldly-life on the philosophy of Dharma. Indeed, the philosophy of Dharma is built on sound psychological and metaphysical foundation : it is out and out social in its value and meaning. Man has to live his life in a planned and organised manner, otherwise he will not be blessed with the glory of perfection. A haphazard growth of life can never make anybody's existence meaningful. Hence, the philosophy of Dharma urges a man to live a life of socio-moral virtues as well as of discipline so as to be able to enhance his own personal goodness. Brahmacharya or the celebate studentship is the stage when a man should learn the philosophy of Dharma. This philosophy bids everyone to understand in proper perspective his duties and responsibilities to others as well as to himself. He should be prepared to discharge them sincerely so as to be able to promote effectively the solidarity and enduring welfare of society.

Worldly Life

The householder who seeks to have fullness and perfection of the world, should follow strictly the code of morals, (Prescribed by the philosophy of Dharma), in all his social dealings. He should be eager to perform all his family duties and social duties in the best possible manner for the material and spiritual benefit of all including himself. The life of a man, to be successful in the worldly sense, should be grounded on satya, tyaga, samyama, Truth, Sacrifice, self-control, kartavya-bhāvanā (devotion to duties),. He should practise contentment because without contentment he will not be able to attain suceess in any activity. His heart should over-flow with the milk of love and sympathy as these are the qualities which lie at the root of family happiness and social peace. He should develop a liberal outlook and a spirit of toleration so as to be able to accommodate other's views and other's needs ; otherwise family life and social life will not be free from conflicts and chaos. He should also be particular about the preservation of his health and vigour so as to be able to remain active and energetic in social life. The philosophy of Dharma teaches a man to respect the world, to love all, to respect all, to give up the habit of hankering after the wealth or property of other people, to perform all social duties, to speak the truth, to live for a full hundred years by doing deeds so as to enable the society to prosper and produce more and more good for the benefit of its members. All these sociomoral duties and values are closely inter-linked with the highest value which is peace and spiritual perfection. The practice of Dharma with sincerity and selflessness will thus make a man good, noble and perfect.

The philosophy of Dharma, being based on upanisadic spiritualism, teaches a man to be ever ready to sacrifice his own good for the good of all. Since there is only one nondual consciousness and the individuals are only its various manifestations, there is no real difference between man and man. One should, therefore, build up his character by selfless activity in such a manner that he will not only be able to enjoy the

satisfaction of mind as a perfect citizen of the society, but will also be able to shine as a brilliant star on the horizon of the world. It is the beauty and bliss of ātman which is to be enjoyed in this world in and through all relations which exist between man and man and also between man and the world. One who succeeds in this respect, succeeds also in winning the best reward of the social iife.

Fuller Life

When by following the philosophy of Dharma, a man will be able to attain perfection as a man, he will then be able to attain peace or liberation which is the highest good. Having completely discharged all social obligations and having acquired all social-moral excellences, a man becomes eager to taste the bliss of the Life Eternal. Here also, the philosophy of Dharma will help him to cross completely the floor of mundane existence. He will have to pass through a preparatory stage when he will have to follow the disciplines laid down by the Philosophy of Dharma. He should study the scriptures, reflect on them so as to make his mind free from doubts, he should cultivate a detached attitude to worldly enjoyment : he should practise karma-yoga as a form of spiritual sādhanā ; he should make his mind free from all sorts of impure thoughts, feelings and emotions. His only aim should be to dedicate his whole life to the Life Divine. Such a soul will then be able to attain perfection in the true sense of the term. It is true that liberation is trans-empirical and trans-moral : but we should not forget that it is to be sought by remaining in a social order and by promoting social good. There is no gap between the empiricial and the trans-empirical. The empirical life, if led thoughtfully and in accordance with the philosophy of Dharma, will find its spontaneous completion in the trans-empirical Divinity.

Indian philosophical attitude towards life centres round the idea that life is not to be spent wholly in irresponsible enjoyment of worldly pleasures. Permanent peace and perfection of life are not compatible with such enjoyment. Real happiness

(either in social life or in the spiritual life) emanates from the very nature of the soul. Hence, it is the enlightened and the spiritually perfected soul that can have a taste of the fullness of life and this goal can be achieved in the best possible manner by following the philosophy of Dharma.

RE-BIRTH AND KARMA

[*The problem of re-birth and karma has been agitating the minds of wise people from time immemorial. Why are we born ? Where shall we go ? What is our fate after the death ? These are the basic queries of the human mind. The author of this article asserts that no scientific solution universally acceptable is possible in regard to this problem ; and so long as science cannot prove beyond doubt that consciousness is nothing but a product of physical elements, the belief in re-birth and karma cannot be wholly discarded.—Editor*]

The law of karma and the theory of re-birth have been accepted as axiomatic truth by all systems of Indian Philosophy except the Cārvāka School. This is due to the fact that philosophers of this country (excepting Cārvākas) have always admitted that the spiritual being is the essential being of man. The shell of flesh and blood is only an artificial adjunct that gets attached to a soul due to avidyā karma. It is because of this shell that the individual soul appears as a worldly-being in a pitiable condition and goes through a process of birth and death, bondage and sufferings till it realises its own true nature and dissociates itself permanently from the psycho-physical organism which is either Māyika or Prākṛitika in nature. Indians in fact, believe in the evolution of the soul from ignorance to knowledge, from an inert condition (Jaḍakalpa) of existence to a fully illuminated state and this evolution needs re-incarnation, times without number. The spiritual life which is the Life Immortal does not supersede the natural life immediately as if by magic. This regeneration needs spiritual culture which cannot be completed in one birth. The unveiling of the immortal man, the birth of the spiritual from the psycho-physical is the true salvation and purpose of life and this purpose of life can be fulfilled only through the continuous efforts of different lives. The soul

which is nothing but pure consciousness, is eternal. It cannot die and cannot be born. It is always there at the background of the psycho-physical life.

There are, of course, differences of belief among different schools of Indian Philosophy regarding the journey of the soul between a death and a birth and also regarding the number and kinds of bodies and the processes of transmigration, still the idea of the continued identity of the soul through different migrations is common to all.

Some explain the *utkramaṇa* of the soul with the help of the non-physical *sukṣma śarīra* and *liṁga śarīra*. Some, again, do not introduce any kind of subtle body to explain the journey of the soul; but all the schools of thought believe that the soul must undergo numerous births, gathering experience from the different strata of life. This belief in re-birth has not, however, been adhered to dogmatically by the different schools of Indian Philosophy. They have collected evidences from life and have based the theory of re-birth on sound arguments. The following are the main arguments which have been put forward by different schools in favour of the theory of re-birth and karma :

(A) Even a newborn baby shows the instinct of sucking and fear of death which the baby has not experienced in this life. The instinctive urges (which are unlearnt) are nothing but samskāras or impressions of previous lives. A new born baby is not an entirely new creation. It had its past lives when it had performed this action. Impressions are already stored up in its mind. So, as soon as the baby sees the mother's breast, this samskāra is immediately aroused and it helps the baby to preserve its life.

Indian Philosophers do not believe that human beings are born with blank minds on which nothing remains written. On the other hand, the belief, here, is this that an individual is

always born with samskāras which are nothing but accumulated thoughts of the past lives, in subtle forms. A man can easily understand all the things of the present life which fit in well with the predominating samskāras of his mind. This is why we often find that although the preceptor teaches the same thing to a number of his disciples, all are not capable of grasping the thing in the same manner. Everybody understands the problem in the light of the dominant *samskāras* of his mind. Prajāpati taught the same lesson to Indra and Virocana but they grasped it differently in accordance with the different samskāras of the mind. There is, then, the instinctive fear of death. The fear of death cannot be inherited from the parents because the children are born before the death of the parents. The fear of death, therefore, must be the experience of the individual and because the individual is still living, he must have acquired it in his previous lives.

(B) Following the upaniṣadic traditions all systems of Indian Philosophy, except the Cārvāka system, believe that bondage is due to karma. It is the mind in its impure state that leads us to perform action and thereby creates a snare of repeated existence for ourselves. The present life of a living individual is nothing but the inevitable consequence of his own accomplished efforts. The life of an ignorant man remains confined to the sphere of the law of karma and the realm of karma is nothing but the realm of re-birth.

The law of karma holds that every action in ordinary human-life springs from desire and results in impressions which become the seeds of future activities and desires. In other words, we can say that every action is followed by corresponding reaction and this law of action and reaction is called the law of karma or the law of cause and effect. So long as a man remains bound to this law of karma, he performs various activities and goes on weaving his own cobweb of birth and death.

The belief in the law of karma is necessary to explain inequalities of life. Persons, born of the same parents and

brought up in the same environment, attain different grades of success in life. Some are learned, some idiots ; some are happy, some miserable.

Moreover, we often find that persons who are doing vicious actions are rolling in wealth whereas persons who are scrupulously honest are living in extreme poverty. Are all these inequalities man-made and removable ? Sometimes we find that even though a person does not suffer from any ill of life, still he is not happy. He is so formed that inspite of his best efforts, he cannot enjoy anything. Even a psycho-analyst fails to cure many of his patients.

Why is it so ?

The ancient Indian Philosophers have tried to explain these apparent riddles of the expirical life with the help of the doctrine of karma and re-birth Man is the maker of his own life. At every moment, he is creating his future life by means of his present actions. There is nothing like a fate or destiny making us happy or miserable inspite of ourselves. Our fate is nothing but the accumulated traces of our own avidya-karma. Since it is the karma that determines the kind of birth that an individual is going to have in the worldly condition of his existence, conceptions of the eternality of the soul, karma and re-birth are very closely connected. If one believes in the eternality of the soul or in the law of karma or in both, he has got to believe in the doctrine of re-birth. The law of karma holds that an individual has got to reap the fruits of his own karma ; but the fruits of all the actions which an individual does in a life are not enjoyed by him in that particular life. So, he has to come again again to reap the fruits of all his actions.

Vātsāyana has said in his commentary on sutra 4-1-10 :

"He for whom Rebirth consists of the birth of one entity and destruction of another entity would be faced with the absurdity that one entity would be deprived of the fruits of his deeds while another would be saddled with the fruits of acts not done by him" (English translation : G. Jha.)

According to Vācaspati Misra, too, we have got to admit that re-incarnation takes place according to the law of karma. If the experiences of pleasures and pains do not depend on the actions of the past lives, then there is no sense in following the instructions of the scriptures. If an individual can enjoy happiness even without doing good actions in any of his lives, then why should he perform scriptural rites which can be done with great difficulty ?

We have already seen that according to Indian tradition, svarupolabdhi is the result of spiritual evolution or gradual progress. This is a sādhanā or spiritual culture which has got to be extended over many lives. In the state of ignorance, the individual remains in an inert condition (jaḍakalpa). He then remains interested merely in the body and its needs. All bodily needs are felt and controlled by biological propensities and the individual is incapable of feeling the presence of the soul in him. To get up from this sleep of ignorance and to feel that the individual in his real nature is something different from and superior to its physical covering, is not an easy task. But the goal of human life is to reach this stage. So, the individual has to struggle hard in different lives so as to be able to know fully what he really is.

It has been pointed out by the followers of Yoga-philosophy that yogins by concentrating on the impressions in this life can go backward to the experiences of their previous births. In this way, memories of the past lives can be revived. This super-normal act of the yogins proves conclusively the doctrine of re-birth.

(C) Man, as a moral agent, can never he satisfied if he is told that like unconscious stones and bricks, he, too, has originated from a combination of material particles and that his life, too, is guided merely by physical and chemical laws. Everybody finds satisfaction in the thought that his life is purposeful and that he has come here to fulfill some end of superior value. In fact, a human body cannot be compared with the unconscious body of a stone. There is an important point of

difference between the two. The stone does not emerge from the action of the germ cells but a human body does. Hence, what is true of a piece of stone cannot be true of the human being.

This, in brief, is the Indian view of karma and re-birth. Now, let us discuss some of the objections which are generally advanced against this theory.

Objections

The modern science of psychology teaches that instincts are not the traces of the individual's own experiences of the past lives ; rather, they are the inherited dispositions or racial habits which prompt the possessor to behave in certain specific ways in realtion to certain specific objects. These instincts undergo changes along with the progressive changes of a particular race. They become well-differentiated and more in number because the original ones gradually send out more and more branches. Hence, instincts are really products of evolution and they can be satisfactorily explained by heredity and evolution without the help of the theory of re-incarnation. The instincts of the successors are the habits of their predecessors and not of their own making. In successive generations, the tendency to acquire the useful habit of the prior generations becomes stronger and stronger and finally the habit will not have to be learnt at all. Certain brain structures will also be formed accordingly and will be passed on from generation to generation.

According to some critics, the fear of death is not instinctive and it does not establish the theory of re-birth. No body is willing to lose any of his belongings because the pleasure and happiness of his life depends on them. The desire to enjoy pleasure is a natural desire. Just as dresses, house, wealth etc. are the upakaraṇas of a man's pleasure, in the same manner his body is his bhogāyatana. Without the body, one is not in a position to enjoy the pleasures of his life. It is no wonder that since worldly-pleasure is valued so much, the fear of losing it due to death or destruction of the body is expressed so prominently in the life of a man.

Further, a belief in karma and re-birth is not necessary to explain the unequal distribution of happiness and sorrow and the differences in temparament, tendencies and inclinations. Persons born of the same parents differ in tendencies and inclinations due to environmental differences. No two children born in different years enjoy the same environmental influences.

Moreover, the law of Nature is to produce variety and multiplicity. It is svabhāva of Prakṛti that there should be differences in Nature, that there should be differences in man.

Lastly, the theory of origin of life which has been established by biological science does not agree with the theory of re-birth. According to the science of biology, reproduction in the sphere of living beings, takes place in two ways (1) sexually and (2) asexually.

In the case of No. 1, a new life is produced when a sperm from the male body fuses its chromosomes with those in the mature egg-cell of the female body. Due to fusion, the hereditary material of the offspring is formed by the hereditary materials contributed by two parents. (Transmission of acquired characteristics is a controversial issue).

In the case of No. 2, the living being divides into two or splits itself into different pieces. Here, the new living being has the same chromosome material as that of its single parent.

In both the cases, however, the body of offspring is formed by the division of cells. Since, the germ-cell contains all the material in its structures called chromosomes, one may be inclined to think that the germ-cell is the jīva. But this cannot be the Indian view because according to Indian view, jīva is indivisible whereas the germ-cell of the body undergoes divisions.

"The alternative hypothesis of a disembodied soul entering into the cell at every instance of cellular division is quite unnecessary by the fact that the dividing parts were alreadyi nstinct with life". (Swami Iśvarananda : Does the soul reincarnate ?)

In the case of sexual reproduction, a single parent is giving birth to its offspring by dividing itself into parts. If a star-fish is divided into parts, then each part develops a new individual by growing automatically new arms and limbs. How are we to explian this type of origination with the theory of re-birth and karma ? The soul of the parent star-fish cannot be divided into parts. Nor can we say that a subtle body attached to a new soul was waiting to enter into the offspring star-fish. This is because the part which became the offspring was alive even when the division was taking place.

Regarding *yogaja jnana* it can be said that these experiences have not been scientifically proved as yet. So, the fact that a yogin can know the facts of his past lives by means of saṁyama is still a miracle and is not widely accepted. The fact that has not been proved conclusively as yet cannot be advanced as proving a hypothesis.

Objections met

All these objections, no doubt, provide us with good material for thought. Before we proceed to solve these difficulties, we should make an attempt to understand clearly the natures of the subtle-body, the *jīva* and the *soul.*

By soul, we mean nothing else but illuminating consciousness. To say that the soul is deathless is nothing but to hold that the negation of consciousness can never be thought of. This is because caitanyābhāva (negation of consciousness) can be conceived of only with the help of caitanya. Pure self-revealing consciousness has no origination or decay, no birth or death. So the question of rebirth does not arise in regard to pure consciousness which is beyond the sphere of karmic influences. Who, then, undergoes the processes of birth and death ? It is the worldly soul which is a mixed category of cit and acit that falls in the snare of karma and moves round the cycle of birth and death. Jīva is consciousness qualified by antaḥkaraṇa or consciousness reflected in antaḥkaraṇa. The antaḥkaraṇa portion of the jiva is acit and this acit portion of the jiva can possess three different states. (1) The unconscious state of the antaḥkaraṇa contains

vāsanās and samskāras of the previous lives in subtle forms. (II) The conscious state which is created at every moment by our perceptions, inference etc., (III) The super conscious state when the mind becomes steady and pure and is in a position to know the past, present and the future and also the subtle and the gross. Ordinarily the conscious state is influenced by the unconscious one and the knowledge that arises in the conscious level is always limited in nature In Western Psychology, instincts have been described as racial habits but in India all these urges are regarded as the individual's own habits of thought and action of the past lives.

Life-stream is flowing in innumerable currents and each one of these currents is undergoing expansion and contraction ; when a particular current contracts, its gross cover falls off and when it again expands it does so with the help of a fresh cover. Light remains in a very subtle form in the subtle wires of electricity. In this state, the light is not visible to us. Light is, however, manifested when a bulb is used. Antaḥkaraṇa too is formed of a very subtle stuff. So, the activities which are taking place in the antaḥkaraṇa are also very subtle. So, these subtle activities need a gross physical body to get manifested. This gross body is formed of the germ-cells.

The germ-cell cannot be regarded as the soul because the germ-cell is constantly undergoing changes whereas pure consciousness is unchangeable. The germ-cell is, in fact, the upādhi of consciousness. The body which is composed of the germ-cells contains not only the so-called inherited dispositions, but it also contains consciousness. The germ-cells cannot make up the personality of a person unless they are imbued with consciousness. Let us admit that the so-called samskāras are nothing but the hereditary materials inherited either from the parents or from the race; but the question still remains : where does the consciousness come from ? Does the consciousness of parents split up and enter into the body of the offspring ? This cannot be, because consciousness is indivisible. If the whole of the consciousness of parents enter into the body of the

offspring, then the parents will cease to have consciousness which is never the case. So, the body of the offspring is imbued with consciousness from some other source. In other words, the body of the offspring gets associated with a different consciousness (i. e., with a different soul). If this is so, then the theory of re-birth is virtually accepted. Science has admitted that the germ-cell contains hereditary material. According to some schools of Indian Philosophy, non-physical samskāras of the citta remain in a subtle cover composed of the subtle tanmātras. This subtle cover is known as the subtle body. The gross body formed of the germ-cells helps the subtle body to work.

The subtle body and the samskāras contained therein are the changeable and movable acidaṁśa of the jiva. It is this unconscious portion that actually passes from life to life getting associated with different gross bodies. The subtle body is devoid of gross materiality (Sthūla-bhautikatva) as it is not covered by annamaya kosha. The subtle physical elements or tanmātras which make up the subtle body are less solidified. The tanmātras which are āhamkārika in nature are capable of movement. The organs, etc., which remain in the subtle body remain merged in the limga. When a man dies, his thought energy in the form of samskāras do not get scattered in space; but this energy remains stored up in the subtle body. Of these samskāras, those which are in a position to find expression in a different personality enter into the sperm of that person who possesses like tendencies. So long as the sperms remain in the body of the father, they remain enlivened by his consciousness; but when they come out of the body of the father, they lose connection with the consciousness of the father. In that case the sperm that has become associated with a subtle body and consequently with a soul acquires potency to fertilise the egg-cell of the mother's body. The remaining sperms being dissociated from the consciousness of the father die immediately. The fertilised egg-cell, then, gradually transforms itself into the form of a human body.

The subtle body which is an intermediary structure between the soul and the gross body is a sheath of energy. So, as energy, it is capable of entering into the body of a human being.

The Nyāya-system has not accepted the subtle body as the intermediary between the soul and the gross body. According to this school, it is the atomic mind of the *jīva* that passes from life to life. The *samskāras* and *vāsanās* remain stored up in the bound-soul. It is the mind that enters into the sperm of the father and creates the *bhogayatana* of the particular *jiva* associated with it.

The hereditary tendencies cannot explain the " why " of the birth of man (why is a man born in a particular environment ?) This " why " becomes intelligible to us only when we believe that a man is born in a particular setting because he has to reap the fruits of his actions of previous lives. In other words it is the law of karma that can give at least a satisfactory explanation regarding the *why* of the origin of life.

In the case of the star-fish too, it can be said that its body is the upādhi of its consciousness. To become many from the division of one individual is the process of reproduction adopted by Nature in the case of such animals. Here also, each part will become associated with a subtle body which is fit to work through it.

Again, to say that variety is the law of nature is not enough. If we say that all combinations of different things and consequent production of multiplicity is taking place as a matter of course (svabhāva-vāda), then there will remain no scope for human initiative and action. Nature, is automatically bringing about changes. The individual will not have to work hard to gain knowledge. Crops will grow by natural powers inherent in the seeds. Farmers will not have to do anything to raise crops.

We cannot of course, deny the influence of the environment. Children generally form their conduct by imitating the thoughts and actions of the older members of their family. Still the difficulty is not solved. The question may still be asked : why does the environment change in a manner which brings about definite changes in the structures and behaviours of two

children, though parents try their level best to keep the environment same for them ? So long as this *why* is not explained fully in terms of purely physical conditions, we shall have to believe in the law of karma and re-birth. To say simply that change is the law of nature is not enough. We must find out the creative force that inspires Nature to undergo changes in various ways and we must also prove that this creative force is purely physical and non-mental in nature and origin.

It is a fact that we are incapable of knowing the mystical experiences of the *yogins ;* because these experiences take place in the super-conscious state of the mind. We cannot know directly the experiences of ordinary minds also. The mind of A works in a way which is different from that of B. Still, when B says that he is having such and such experiences in his mind, A readily accepts them although A cannot perceive directly B's mental states. (A may not even know that such states can arise in the mind of a man.) Then, why should we hesitate to accept the reports of the *yogins* who have reached a super normal state of experience which is entirely different from the normal mental state ? Why should we expect that we should be able to test the validity of yogic knowledge with the perverted structure of our ordinary mind ?

In fact, the problem of re-birth and karma is a very old one, the solution of which has been disturbing the minds of the wise people from time immemorial. The questions,—"Why are we born ? Where shall we go ? What is our fate after death ?—are the basic queries of a human-mind. These were the questions which disturbed the mind of Naciketas who wanted to have their solutions from the God of Death.

Truly speaking, these questions can be solved only individually by one's own thinking in accordance with his own temperament and inclinations. No scientific solution, universally acceptable is possible in regard to this problem ; but so long as science cannot prove beyond doubt that consciousness is nothing but a product of physical elements, the belief in re-birth and karma cannot be wholly disregarded.

THE VEDIC AGE : ITS HUMANISTIC APPROACH

The period extending from about 2000 B. C. to 600 B. C. is generally known as the Vedic period. During this period, the Mantras, the Brahmanas and the Upaniṣads were composed. The history of Brahmanical religion can rightly be supposed to begin with the hymns of the Rig Veda. From the historical evidence gathered so far, it appears that the Aryan people of the age were not recluses who used to live away from all material and human concerns : on the other hand, they were primarily engaged in the search for the ways and means by which they could increase their physical, material and moral well being. They did not separate the real from the mundane life and existence. It was primarily the human interest that had driven them to propitiate nature-gods. They were no less eager to unlock the secrets of the universe than the people of the modern age; and this also they wanted to do not for the attainment of liberation but for deriving human usefulness from natural phenomena. The only drawback noticed in their case was the lack of scientific and rational method of approach. They were eager to control natural phenomena by winning the grace of their presiding deities through prayers and chanting of mantrâs. The prayers which were offered unto various gods were primarily intended for worldly things such as riches, cattle, children and the like. Life of these Aryan people was simple, fresh and full of hopes and expectations for worldly happiness. They were not at all gloomy or pessimistic. Life was a good thing for them and they were out in the world to enjoy life to its full brim. It was this passionate love for both life and material prosperity which had actually encouraged them to face the non-aryans of the Indus Valley who were beyond doubt, more advanced in culture and civilisation. They also wanted to exploit fully natural phenomena for their needs but it was beyond their power to bring Nature under their control. So, nature-gods were imagined and were believed to be of

superior powers exercising living influences on the social life of the vedic people. The sages, who were the leaders of the society, had disclosed through their prayers the way of pleasing these gods so that they might bestow wealth and prosperity on the vedic people. This was, how various gods like Indra, Varuna, Surya, etc., appeared on the horizon of the vedic life and started exercising powerful influences on the day-to-day life of the aryan people. They prayed to God for help in all the situations of life including victory in the battles with the non-aryans. In the Rg Veda, for example, the sage has uttered :

> *"The evil doing dasyu is around us, senseless*
> *keeping false laws, inhuman ;*
> *Oh ! Slayer of enemies, batter*
> *the weapon of the dasas.*
>
> (*Rg. Veda—X—22*)

The hymns of the *Rg. Veda* also reveal that these Aryans had the feeling that they should not live in this world if they were not provided with various sorts of worldly enjoyments. They also assumed the responsibility for improving the conditions of their lives both individually and collectively. There are many hymns in which gods were propitiated to bestow all good things on the Aryans as a tribe or community. Asvins, for example, were requested earnestly to bring wealth and prosperity to all the Aryans (Rg. Veda 1.47). The Dawn was, again, invoked to give the Aryans, residential houses, cows, corns, etc. She was also requested to kill the enemies of the Aryan people. (Rg. Veda 1.48). Whenever the sages wanted to have some good things of life, they had expressed their sincere desires to share those things with all the members of the tribe. Such an attitude was definitely humanistic.

This humanistic tendency seemed to be the outcome of the primitive collective life of the Aryan people, the faint currents of which could be traced even through all the subsequent stages of the evolution of the Aryan society. The Aryan people had always displayed a community feeling based on spiritual unity. An individual was always viewed as an individual belonging to

a particular community and it was the good of the community that used to get preference over individual concerns. Collective enjoyment of happiness seemed to have been the goal of the social life of the Aryan people.

Again, adoration of all human excellences with a sincere desire to imbibe them is another element of humanism displayed by the thought and culture of the vedic people. Godheads were believed to be the diverse manifestations of a supreme power, behind and above, controlling and moving all objects and phenomena. The supreme purpose of life in their opinion should, therefore, be to grow into higher varieties of spiritual existence. Indeed, it was the journey of the vedic seers up the hill of their true being that had found finest expression in and through these hymns and prayers. The vedic sages did not utter the mantras to please the Supreme God or gods (who were supposed to be His various manifestations) for personal pleasures only : on the other hand, he was declaring that one should seek to know the Supreme God without which Rk Mantras would be of no use to him. To see truth and to know truth is the privilege only of man. Hence, to attain the greatness of manhood, one should seek to enrich mind with the knowledge of the highest and the best; because the spiritual progress is the only thing that can make him immortal. So, it can be reasonably said that the seed of humanism in the form of realisation of the excellences of human-life was definitely present in the dim past of the vedic age.

Human aspiration to rise to the higher level of existence by getting rid of all the impurities of his soul through divine grace has repeatedly found expression through the Rg. Veda.

"Oh Agni, illuminator of darkness, day by day we approach you with holy thought bringing homage to you."

"If we, Oh Varuna, have offended against a friend, or if we have offended against an all-time comrade or a brother or an inmate—whether belonging to us, Oh Varuna, or a stranger,—do you remove that offence from us."

Yajurveda : In the Yajurveda also, we find the same humanistic outlook.

Yajurveda : Chapter I, No. 3—"May he purify us through the store of true knowledge and all sciences contained in the Vedas elevating selfless deeds."

Yajurveda : Chapter I, No. 9—"Oh ye men, increase the store of goods acquired by honest and fair means to be used in the service of humanity. May your life be constantly dedicated to this principle. May the spiritually minded people also not give up this humanitarian work."

Yajurveda : Chapter I, No. 11 : "I resort to agriculture and craft for removing poverty and ministering happiness to all."

These passages clearly prove that the vedic ritualistic performances were not merely mechanical but were also of great social and ethical value.

Humanism : its spiritual basis

The Ṛg. vedic sages have supposed human life to be rooted not in its finite manifestation but in the infinite being of the soul or ātman. It is due to this spiritualistic attitude to life that in ancient India, the worldly life has never been wholly divorced from the sacred. To be endowed with human excellences was the goal of the social life because such a perfected personality alone can find his final refuge in the great spiritual harmony of the world. So, the principle of Ṛta or dharma was supposed to embrace life in all aspects. Both the physical and the religio-moral worlds were supposed to be governed by the principle of Ṛta. In the moral world, the principle was deemed to find its expression in the sense of justice which was to be concretised and actualised in and through social relations. Human life in the society was a replica of the heavenly life. So, there should be harmony and concord, justice, and fair dealings on the earth also. These people used to think that there were not only indissoluble bonds between man and man but there was also an intimate relation between man and the great spiritual force behind and beyond the universe. Both

heaven and earth were supposed to be the component notes of the great Spiritual Harmony which was looked upon as both transcendent to and immanent in finite life and the universe.

These people seem to believe that human life does not possess bio-social dimension only; it seems to have a transcendent dimension of spirituality as well. So, bio-social values are to be harmoniously blended with spiritual values so as to enable a man to attain his completeness as a spiritual being smoothly and spontaneously without any break. Values are indeed the efflugent glow that streams out from the heart of a perfect harmony – a harmony that finds expression in the Ṛta or Satya that reigns supreme in the physical, the moral and the religious spheres. In the religious sphere, Ṛta used to refer to sacrifices or rites. The eternal harmony or order implied by Ṛta must be respected even by the immortal gods. It was Ṛta which was supposed to remove all physical and moral impurities of human minds and also to bless them with the elixir of humanity. It was this conception of a single unifying spiritual principle as the source and support of all living beings that had formed the corner stone of the humanitarian sentiment of the vedic people.

From the historical evidences collected so far, it seems to us that such a conception started gaining ground in Indian soil when the Aryans had settled down in this country after defeating completely the non-Aryans. In the initial tribal state of the social life, the Aryans seemed to believe that all members of a tribe had descended from a common stock and that all of them should be supposed to share a common life and a common existence. Such a view might have given rise to a monotheistic or monistic outlook which seemed to form the kernel of the overt polytheism of the vedic religion. It was the vision of oneness of the tribal life emanating from the bosom of some spiritual reality which had become the perennial source of the humanistic sentiments of the vedic religion. It was

this living humanism which had actually succeeded in saturating the Indian life of the vedic age with sweetness and sympathy.

In the vedic age, the main desire of man was to realise the vastness and magnanimity of the soul by completely identifying himself with his own social group. The individual was, thus, regarded merely as a functioning component of social organisation. He was seen in the social context and never as isolated individual. Personal tendencies were not to be cultivated and self-assertive individuality was not to be developed, because they could realise that humanity consisted in the full development of the vision of oneness based on the finer sentiments of love, friendship and spiritual freedom. The tribal solidarity was very important and an individual could not have any worthy existence if he was ousted from the clan. To live together, sharing a common life was the motto of the vaidika people. Land was commonly cultivated under common ownership and all social, economic and religious functions also used to be performed on a common basis.

—Rg. Veda–1.5., 1.9.

Materialism: not the keynote:

It is incorrect to suppose that the humanism of the vedic people was an offshoot of a materialistic outlook on life. It is true that these people were interested in the material prosperity and material gain but the hedomistic tone which echoed through the prayers of the sages was not wedded to a materialistic conception of the world. Inspite of their hankering after material gain and material prosperity, these people always gave expression to a deep faith in the spritual reality and also in the unchangeable nature of the moral law. "The rivers stream forth right, the sun shines for the truth.... and the path of the ancient gods in heaven is not to be transgressed." (Rg. Veda–105, 5). Such a faith is opposed to materialism. The vedic sages wanted to be in affectionate bond with the gods ; they also longed to remain the worshippers of gods as passionately and sincerely as is usual with every theist of the modern age. The distinction is noticeable only in the fact that a theist of the present day seeks the grace

of God to attain his spiritual perfection whereas these people sought the grace of gods for attaining both worldly happiness and mental purity. The passionate desire of the worshipper to be in intimate relation with his beloved god is also met with in the vedic hymns.

"All my thoughts seeking happiness extol Indra, longing for him ; they embrace him as wives embrace a fair young bridegroom, him, the divine giver of gifts, that he may help me ! My mind is directed to Indra and does not turn from thee; On thee, I rest my desire, Oh ! much invoked one." (Ṛg Veda-10, 43). The mutual relation between God and the devotee is a characteristic of theism and not of materialism. All through the hymns of the Ṛg. Veda, it is evident that the sages were guided principally by the glow of a natural intuition (*Sahaja prajñā*) of the eternal spirit and which was the real source of their mystic utterings. The mystic spirit not only suffused the natural phenomena but it also moistened the thoughts and feelings of the vedic people. It is evident from the Ṛg. vedic hymns that the vedic people were not satisfied with what was presented to them as mere sights and sounds, colours and smells : they did make sincere efforts to feel in them the presence of some mystic spirit which was the life-giving principle behind and beyond the phenomenal show. The principle was infused with the glow of a supraphysical light. They felt as if they were living in the midst of mystic influences which were guiding them in all phases of worldly existence and this feeling was expressed through all the mantras which had for that reason become the vehicles to lead them agreeably to spiritual power and truth. It was because the texture of the life of the vedic people was woven with the multi-coloured hue of a rich and infinite spiritual being that the vibrating notes of humanism could be found in abundance in the social life of India through all its various stages of evolution.

Upaniṣadic Age (*700 B.C. to 600 B.C.*)

Coming to the age of the upaniṣads, we find that according to the upaniṣadic thinkers also, there can be no true brahmahood

unless it is based on the cultivation of humanistic morality. The humanism of this period was to end in the mystic experience of the oneness of all which was the final goal and end of the life of man. Human good does not lie in pure material enjoyment nor does it lie in rigid ascetic spirituality. Material well being must be linked with spiritual well-being of man. In fact, it is detachment (born of spiritual perfection) and not intense involvement in material pleasures that enables a man to enjoy the world in a rational and human way. In the Brh. upaniṣad we find Yājna Valkya desiring both spiritual perfection and material well-being. (Brh IV, 1.1 & 1.7)

The Taittirīya upaniṣad has overtly acknowledged the intimate relationship between the material prosperity and spiritual well-being of man. (Taittirīya-11.8). Secular life is not to be divorced from the sacred life of the spirit: on the other hand, the secular life is to be linked with the sacred life, if man sincerely wishes to attain moral and spiritual perfection. Man should love man as an end and not as a means to his own happiness. This is because the love that one bears to another is only the reflection of that Great Love which is the Ātman. One and the same reality is manifesting itself in innumerable forms of the living beings. So, all of them have equal value and equal significance in the scheme of the Life eternal. The strings of a musical instrument are different in size and thickness : but all of them are equally necessary to produce a perfect harmony of sounds. Tattirīya upaniṣad has again and again instructed human beings to practise humanity as a cardinal virtue of human life. Man is to be humanised and his material needs and desires are to be saturated by the never-ending light of the Ātman so that human nature may receive orderly direction and harmonious development even in the midst of his social relations.

Now, it was because of such an outlook that even with the introduction of the Varṇa system which was a system of division of the society into higher and lower classes and also of keeping the lowest class in a state of subjugation and slavery,

the wise men of India were not inhumanly cruel in prescribing rules for regulating the social life of the *Dasas* and the *Sudras*. The cruel treatment which the Greek slaves had received in the hands of their Roman conquerors was inconceivable in India. The defeated people of America, Africa and Australia were rooted out by the Europeans who happened to be the winners of the battles. The Aryans, in India, on the contrary, were liberal enough to include the defeated non-Aryans in their social fold, of course with some restrictions on their powers and privileges. It is true that the tribal system with its collective life and primitive communism was never wholly rooted out from India at any period of its social history ; even then, it seems to us that it was the awareness of the spiritual oneness of all which had actually shed the light of humanism in the socio-political thoughts of Indian people, in the age of the *vedas* and the *upaniṣads*.

HUMANISTIC APPROACH OF THE DHARMASUTRAS AND THE EPICS

[In the earlier article under "The Vedic Age : Its Humanistic Approach" the author dealt with the Vedas and the Upaniṣads in a brief manner so as to bring out the elements of humanism involved in all their teachings. In the present article, the author discusses briefly the humanistic approach of the Dharmasutras —the Sacred Books— and the epics of ancient India—the Mahabharata and the Ramayana—Editor.]

The Dharma sūtras or the Sacred Law-books of Ancient India are chiefly concerned with social usages aud customs of everyday life of the people. The common impression that these law books are inhumanly cruel towards the slaves or the dasas, is not correct. Let us discuss here the views of some of the noted law-givers of ancient India.

As we all know, Manu occupies a unique position in the socio-political life of Indian people. He is regarded as the father of mankind. Manu is credited with the promulgation of such rules of conduct which were essential for ensuring the stability and progress of the social life of the people of that age. A significant item of our social life is Varṇa Vibhāga (class-division) which is still exerting an undesirable influence on the social behaviour of our country men.

Origin of Varṇa System

The origin of Varṇa has been stated in many philosophical literatures of ancient and mediaeval India. The most well-known source of Varṇa is, however, the Purusha Sukta of the Ṛg. veda, in which the Great Purusha is said to have produced the entire universe including the four classes of people—Brahmins, the Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra. According to Manu the purpose of the creation of four Varṇas was the progress of the world. (Manu Samhita 1·31).

This shows that according to Manu, human societies were the necessary institutions through the influences of which alone, individuality could develop in a proper manner. Both the individual and the society should be understood in inter-relation with one another and an individual should never be set above the social organisation to which he belongs. The institution of four Varṇas or the division of the society into four classes of people was then supposed to be the best form of social organization to further human progress and human perfection. The concept of equality of rights and privileges was not accepted as the basis of society because they could not find equality in Prakriti or Nature. Two men exactly equal in all respects (i. e. physically, morally and spiritually) are not normally found in Nature. In fact Nature is multicoloured or diverse. Men are different, their needs are different, their physical, moral and intellectual capacities too are different.

Varṇavibhāga as stated earlier, was a social plan of the period which might be regarded as an outcome of a developed concept of humanity. By this system, individuals of various capacities could get equal opportunities to show their inherent powers in different spheres of life. This was, indeed, a harmony of multicoloured personalities in a social unit. The class of a man used to be the indicator of his temperament and spiritual attainments. It seems to us that it is not correct to say that it was malice or hatred towards the *dasas* or *shudras* which had motivated such a division of the Aryan society. On the other hand the wise men of the age, perhaps wanted to establish a harmonious and stable society by making economists, politicians, traders, soldiers, servants and the priests to accept willingly their respective obligations to the society. All work was looked upon as socially useful and economically significant.

According to the law-givers of the age, the society was under an obligation to give its members appropriate scope to develop the natural capacities without being interfered with by others. Their humanitarian outlook inspired them to accept such a scheme of social life in which a right man could

always be found for the right position in both professional and religious spheres. This class division also used to limit the fantastic aspirations and unlimited greed of the individuals. Pleasures of the worldly life were to be enjoyed according to the inherent capacities of human beings. "Each according to his capacity" seemed to be the motto of these wisemen in regard to the distribution of the material wealth of the society. A man should enjoy fame, prosperity and power according to the quality of his character. Material well-being was not the final goal of a human life : the final goal was spiritual perfection. The more perfect the man was the greater was his right to hold a superior position in the society. This seemed to us to be the underlying spirit of the class-division of the society.

Inheritance or Sanskaras

It is true that Varṇa was ordinarily determined by birth. This was due to the fact that according to Indian tradition human beings were never believed to be born with blank minds on which nothing remained written. On the other hand, human beings were supposed to be born with Sanskāras (impressions) which were nothing but the accumulated feelings, thoughts, and desires of the past lives in subtle forms. Hence, the members of a particular class were supposed to be born with such Sanskāras which would make them specially suitable for the work assigned to that particular class. Even today, we believe in inherited capacities of human beings. Varnas were, however, flexible. A member of the lower rank could be admitted to a higher rank if he could acquire capacities and excellences of character prescribed for it. This also confirms the inherently humanistic nature of the social approach of these thinkers. The class-division was not, originally, an intolerance : on the other hand it was meant to establish a truly democratic society in which each member would get appropriate scope to develop his own inherited skill and capacities in the best possible manner.

It was in the dark age of Indian History that this system had degenerated into an instrument to oppress the lower castes. It

is true that according to Manu, the main duty of a Shudra was to serve the Brahmin householders, but these Brahmins were required to be learned and virtuous. Such a duty was assigned to the dasas and the Shudras who (in all probability) were not the followers of the Vaidika scriptures. Ajājnika Shudras, who spoke a different language, were thought suitable not for the performance of the Vaidika sacrifices but for rendering the menial services. The Aryans did not kill these strangers whom they had defeated but they had been assigned some social duties and had thus been considered useful members of the Aryan society. Although the Shudras were conscripted for household services of the upper classes, specially of the Brahmins, still the humanistic outlook of the law-giver had inspired him to make it obligatory on his master to provide them with the necessary comforts of life. The master was under a sacred obligation to satisfy all the essential needs of his Shudra servant.

Gautama

The same humanitarian outlook can be discovered in the Gautama-Dharma-sutra as well. Gautama too made it a duty of the master to provide his servants with his used shoes, umbrellas, garment, etc. In the present age, no doubt, such facilities are generally provided by masters for their servants; but instances are not rare where masters are not so sympathetic in this regard. It is noticeable that in that far off age, Gautam could think of the persons in menial service with such human sympathy and human consideration.

The Shudras, too, were advised to follow the path of truthfulness and purity. They were also asked to perform religious rites for celebrating the birth of the child etc. The lawgivers of the age were eager to ensure the peace and happiness of the lower classes also in their family-life, religious-life and moral-life. The lawbook of Gautam declares : "The Shudra shall also offer the funeral oblation. He should live with his wife only; and serve the higher castes. From them, he shall seek to obtain his livelihood. And the Arya under whose protection, he places himself must support him if he becomes unable to work."

No man was used in ancient India merely as a means to another person's happiness. Every man was supposed to be the spark of the Divine Light and so he should be treated as such. The master who was receiving service from a lower class man, should never forget that he was under an obligation to look after the physical, moral and spiritual well-being of his servant.

Mankind as a whole is marching towards spiritual freedom and the social life is just a stepping stone to that higher life of the spirit. Moral excellences which constitute the essence of humanism blossom into human hearts in and through various social relations which knit together the lives of different persons into one whole. It is needless to say that if we are to reach the goal of spiritual freedom, then it should be our foremost duty to purify our minds by acquiring human excellences through humanised social relations. The wisemen of ancient India were never oblivious of this cardinal truth of Jiva-hood and so they had never minimised the significance of life in any of its forms.

It is true that the slave was not allowed to make independent property of his own but he had full right over affectionate gifts which he used to receive from time to time from the master's family. A slave could also part with animals which he had received as affectionate gifts from other persons. Cases were not rare when masters of their own accord used to liberate even the hereditary slaves. Thus, even in the slave-owning State of Indian society, slaves were looked upon as human beings and were never treated like lower animals. It is true that the Shudras and slaves used to enjoy limited social privileges and rights and had to court more severe punishment in cases of transgression of socio-political laws than the upper classes. Side by side, it is also true that they were never deprived of all privileges and rights of man and were not degraded to the status of lower animals. They were never forced to fight with wild animals as was the case with the Greek slaves at ancient Roman shows. The Aryans were liberal enough to allow the Shudras a place in the scheme of their social life and had not made any unkind attempt

to wipe them out from the face of the earth. It was their humanistic approach to life, based on the spiritual oneness of all living beings, that had paved the way for a harmonious and comparatively peaceful integration between the Aryan and the non-Aryan cultures and also to accord the non-Aryans, certain human rights and privileges so as to enable them to live and enjoy certain amount of creature comforts of life in a peaceful social environment.

Epics of Ancient India

In the Mahabharata, we find that a humanitarian outlook based on the fundamental unity of spirit, had added a refined and delicate glow to all human deliberations and human thinking. The wise men of the age were mainly concerned with bringing about unity in a vast mass of multicoloured and multilingual races with different cultural levels. It was in the epic period that the temple worship and image worship gained so much prominence that sacrifices and sacrificial altars had to suffer loss of prestige and position in the life of the Vedic people. The very fact that the non-Aryan deities were placed on a footing of equality with the Aryan gods proves that the Aryans were not inhumanly hostile towards the non-Aryans. It was their human sympathy and wider vision of human life that inspired them to harmonise their own culture with the culture of the defeated non-Aryan people who were strangers to them both in regard to language and the pattern of living. The Mahabharata has been given the status of the Dharma Sastra and as such it deals with various aspects of social life knitted together by the indissoluble tie of the feeling of oneness of the spirit, a feeling that has the seed of humanism impregnated in it.

The Ramayana too has beautifully humanised the different kinds of relations which exist between man and man. It is because of this human sympathy that the sages of India have always advised us to practise detachment and not to get too much involved in personal pleasures and enjoyment. If we are concerned too much with our own profit and loss, then we shall never be able to work for the good of other human beings. We

shall never be able to assume responsibility for the life of mankind as a whole. We shall remain stuck to the net of our own narrow egoistic happiness and shall never be able to appreciate and feel the beauty of the vast encompassing life which is revealing itself at every moment through multiple colours and forms. It is only by standlng outside of the narrow circle of his own egoistic existence that a man can really appreciate the beauty of life, can taste the immortal nectar that streams out in abundance from the innermost core of life and can also add flavour to human existence by his own selfless humanitarian services. There is no doubt that spiritual humanism can make a place for the sublime, the beautiful and the good even in a complex social set up by adding the new dimension of spirituality to existence.

Spiritual humanism

It is possible to catch a glimpse of such spiritual humanism in Chapter 60 of the Shanti Parva of the Mahabharata where we find Yudhisthira asking Bhishma the following questions :

"Raja kena Vivardhate
Kena paurashca bhrityashca
Vardhante Bharatarshabho"

In other words, Bhishma was requested to explain how a king could attain his own material progress along with the material well-being of all his subjects including the dasas or the shudras. Incidentally in the history of the West, we hardly find an instance in which the king was seriously thinking of the material well-being of his slaves.

In ancient India, the social scheme, usages, customs and the rules of conduct were framed in such a manner that any intelligent and prudent king could realise that he would not be able to stabilise himself merely by increasing his military power; he would also have to look after the well-being of all his subjects, —a duty which was to be given the top priority by the king. The Mahabharata has repeatedly asserted that the essentially human qualities like truthfulness, non-anger, compassion willingness to share the material output of the land, living

with all members, friendliness, etc. should be cultivated by the men of all the varnas. It was their conviction that humanitarian relations between man and man could not be preserved in society unless all members were morally high. If any section of the society was allowed to live the life of lower animals then they would surely drag down the upper classes by their ill-will and hatred. Just as right man for the right job was supposed to be absolutely necessary, in the same manner awakening of humanitarian qualities also was regarded as necessary for proper upkeep of the socio-political life. It was because of this feeling that the law-givers of ancient age had given us the forms of Varnashrama dharmas and Sadharana dharmas and not a charter of human rights.

CARVAKAS : WHAT THEY STOOD FOR ?

Carvakas are generally grouped as a class of materialistic thinkers of ancient India who participated in a new movement of thought which started in the Upaniṣadic period. This new movement was actually directed against the hereditary priesthood and Brahmanic orthodoxy. Naturally, therefore, the leaders of this movement were not members of the Brahmanical tradition, based mainly on the Karma Kanda of the Vedas.

The torch-bearers of the New Movement did not accept the authority of the Vedas : in fact they were bold to declare that the entire Brahmanical system was nothing but a fraud. They declared their faith and confidence in their own efforts and intellect. They also believed sincerely that they would be able to find out (without Super-natural assistance) the real secret of human happiness. It is perhaps not incorrect to say that the builders of this new movement had the outlook of a rationalistic philosophy. The adherents of this movement used to be called *Sramanas* as opposed to Brahmanas.

Teachings of the Carvakas : A Sramana Group

If we study in details, the origin and growth of the *Sramana* movement of ancient India, we shall find that it had great philosophical significance. The aim of these Sramanas was to unveil the hidden truth of life so as to be able to obtain happiness and peace of mind. This new movement developed spontaneously in and through a number of different philosophical schools. One such school was that of the *lokayatas* or Carvakas. The Carvakas were the people who asserted the freedom of thought and will and denied boldly the operation of the law of Karma and the consequent determinism in the human-world.

Happiness as the End of Life

According to these philosophers, the aim of life was to live happily in the midst of a happy world. They were also

convinced that human happiness could be obtained only by living a moral and orderly life in a peaceful and well organised society, because orderly conduct was regarded as the essential feature of a good and happy life. Indisciplined and impure conduct can produce only disorder in human-life alongwith unhappiness—its inevitable results. They were eager to have a peaceful and well organised society which would not provide any scope for exploitation in any sphere of the social life. To them, even the simple joys of life were valuable. Happiness was supposed to be the only force which could enrich life with living freshness and inner dynamism. The materialists did not believe in the existence of any supernatural deity as the guide and ruler of human beings.

Happiness mixed with Pain

The Carvakas were right in declaring that nobody could enjoy pure or unmixed happiness, in his worldly life. We also feel that both pain and happiness are hard facts of life which can never be avoided by any one. So, a man should never be afraid of the sorrowful experiences of life and should never be dejected on that account. Human life should be viewed as a continuous struggle against and victory over sorrows and sufferings of life ; but since the basic note of human-life was supposed by the Carvakas to be happiness and nothing but happiness the human beings were advised to conquer unhappiness by facing it bravely and with circumspection. We came across the following passage of the Carvaka philosophy in the Sarvadarshana Samgraha of Madhavacharayya : "It is our wisdom to enjoy the pure pleasure as far as we can and to avoid the pain which inevitably accompanies it.——It is not, therefore, for us through a fear of pain to reject the pleasure." Such a secular attitude of the Carvaka School naturally kept its philosophical thought confined strictly to the worldly life and empirical existence ; even then we do find that this school had tried sincerely to give the world the vision of a harmoniously integrated human life streaming out from the heart of a perfect harmony of human values forming the ground stone of a good monarchical society.

Carvaka Philosophy and the Socio-religious Atmosphere of the Age :

If we study the cultural history of the period in which the Carvaka School originated and flourished, we can very well attribute the anti-orthodoxy of the Carvakas to the degenerated socio-religious atmosphere of the age. Truly speaking, in the social life of the age, the fourfold division of the Aryan society was sufficiently hardened and the Brahmin class came to play the most dominating role in the political and cultural life of the Hindus. The priests alone became the custodian of both the mundane and the extra-mundane good of human beings. The current belief was that a man could enjoy happiness (both worldly and other worldly) only by following the instructions of the priest. Dharma was totally identified with the performance of religious sacrifices. The common belief was that human happiness could be brought about only by the performance of the various forms of sacrifices. The Vedic rites were supposed to possess wonderful magic power to fulfil human desires ; and so performance of these rites was the only kind of Dharma, the only kind of duty. The Brahmin priest was supposed to be the divinity in human form. In Spiritual power he was supposed to be next only to God and he was the person, specially chosen by the Almighty to guide and control the human-world. In fact, in every aspect of socio-religious life, it was the Brahmin class that used to demand precedence, honour and worship. It was against such unjust domination of the Brahmins together with their perverted teachings of dharma and adharma, resulting in merit and demerit that the materialistic philosophers raised their voice of protest. (*Dharmā-dharma na vidyate, na phalam puṇya papayoḥ.*). This school believed in the existence of those things only which could be verified directly or indirectly by sense-experience. In other words, the sensible world that lost its charm in the eye of the common man due to the perverted teachings of the Brahmins, was, again brought into the forefront of life by the up-holders of the materialistic faith. The world was to be

regarded as real and good. One should not therefore, be afraid of living and should not hanker after heaven and hell. They should not also impoverish themselves in wealth only to feed the greedy Brahmins. On the other hand, they should act wisely to build up happy and prosperous families and should have enough food and drink to be served to them at scheduled time of the day (Khāda, piva) and should not bother about death or life after death.

In the sphere of political life also, it appears to us from the available records that the materialists were in favour of accepting monarchy as the most effective form of government. (*Lokasiddho bhavet rājā*.....). The king was to be looked upon as the ruler of the people of a country. If anybody was to be called God, then it was he who could be so regarded. He was an earthly God, entrusted with the duty of looking after the material and moral well being of the people. Nobody should believe in the existence of any super-natural God who could be regarded as the creator, preserver and destroyer of the world. It was only as the ruler of the people that a king could be designated as 'Isha' ; otherwise he had no divine spark in him. In fact, according to Carvakas, there was no such Divinity lying at the root of the world. It was in the age of the Carvakas that the primitive republican states based on the old tradition of primitive social solidarity were in a declining condition and the monarchical system was gaining ground ; because of such a political atmosphere, the Carvakas seemed to have drifted towards the monarchical type of government. It appears that the conviction of this school was that only a just and honest king treating his people both affectionately and firmly, would be in a proper position to make his kingdom happy and prosperous. This conviction was, perhaps, due to the fact that by this time, the Aryan tribes had already consolidated in small kingdoms. Although due to remarkable development of the sacrificial cult of the Brahmanic tradition, the common people of the age were made to believe that they would be able to obtain peace and

prosperity here and hereafter only by performing sacrifices, still there were also free thinkers with keen intelligence and broad human sympathy who could realise the emptiness and absurdity of this religion of vedic sacrifices and were eager to save the common man from falling into the pit of misery to meet the intellectual death. The Carvakas, who constituted a group of such free thinkers were out to assert boldly that the sacrifices were not impregnated with any supernatural force to regulate the destiny of man. Their main concern was to add the flavourof humanity to the internal socio-political atmosphere by introducing freedom of thought and action in the secular life of man.

We have already noted that the Carvakas did not look upon the king as Divine. He was simply supposed to be the most worthy and authoritative person. They sincerely believed that a kingdom was bound to be prosperous if it was ruled by a good, powerful and honest king. It was the king who was to be held primarily responsible for both moral and material prosperity of the people. Such was the attitude of the Carvakas and they were out to propagate the philosophy of a happy human-life having its root in secularism and sound political administration. Their religion was the religion of humanity based on genuine sympathy and love for man and the world.

Carvakas and the Philosophy of Life of the Aryan People :

If we try to understand the socio-religious ideal of the Ṛgvedic Aryans, we are sure to find that the true ideal of these people was happiness and fullness of life. The world was supposed to be saturated with honey and bliss. (*Madhuvātā Ritāyate, madhu Ksharanti Sindhavaḥ.*) Devas who were nothing but the manifestations of the supreme immortal light or *Amritajyotiḥ* in the forms of natural phenomena, used to gladden their hearts. The Ṛgvedic sages were not recluses and did not want to live away from all material and human concerns. They were householders and were very eager to enjoy life. They wanted to unveil the secrets

of the universe not for the attainment of liberation but for deriving human usefulness from natural phenomena. As they were ignorant of any scientific and rational method of approach they were eager to control natural phenomena by winning the grace of their presiding deities through prayers and chanting of mantras. They did not discover that the worldly-life was in any sense, undesirable or painful. Had it been so, they would not have requested the gods to grant them a long and happy worldly-life. In and through the hymns, the sages had always expressed an intense desire to enjoy the life in this world to its full brim. It was this passionate love for both life and material prosperity which had actually inspired them to face the non-aryans of the Indus Valley; and it was the same passionate love for life and happiness of the world which drove the materialists to enter into an ideological fight with the priestly class. The other worldly attitude of the sacrificial cult and the consequent priestly domination of the age were poignantly criticised by the Carvakas. The Carvakas, too, wanted to taste the ambrosia of the worldly-life and for that reason they had fought so fearlessly against the Brahmanic tradition.

The historical records bear testimony to the fact that in the initial stage of monarchy, the Aryans were not in favour of recognizing the divine character of the king. The king was looked upon as a military leader only who was entrusted with the duty of defending his kingdom. He was a man of this world and he was expected to work for the material good and prosperity of his people. It was this secular attitude of the Aryans that had found a forceful expression in the philosophy of life of the Carvakas. According to both the Carvakas and the Aryans of the early stage, the ideal to be aimed at was a happy and healthy social life and so in this respect the Carvakas were not opposed to the Aryans. In fact, to live together by sharing a common life of happiness was the original ideal of the Aryans. Sannyāsa or renunciation was not a blossom of the Aryan-

thought. Even when renunciation was included in the four-fold scheme of life due to impact of the non-Aryan culture, it was accorded the fourth or the last place in the said scheme. On the other hand, it was the stage of the house-holder which was regarded as the most important one in the four-fold scheme of human-life.

Moreover, Mokṣa or liberation, which the Carvakas denied was also supposed to be really non-Aryan in origin. The dominant idea of the Aryan mind about human destiny was that of a future life in some other sphere of existence. It was only in the latest parts of the Vedas that the conception of liberation had made its appearance in a very vague form.

It is, therefore, reasonable to hold that originally the Aryans used to believe in the three ends of human-life—dharma, artha and kāma. In the Yajurveda for example, it has been stated that men should increase the store of goods (artha) acquired by honest and fair means (dharma) to be used for happiness of all (kāma). Such was also the belief of the Carvakas.

It is, therefore, wrong to hold that the Carvakas used to believe only in artha and kāma. If we study the teachings of the Carvakas with an open and unbiased mind we shall certainly admit that there is rational justification for believing that the materialists wese not against dharma which was for them equivalent to orderliness, consistency and human sympathy. They were against dharma only when the word was used in the sense of sacrificial duty. The Mahabharata gives us the story of a Carvaka philosopher who cursed Yudhisthira for killing his own friends and relatives only for gaining the throne. Had "pleasure at any cost" been the ideal of the Carvakas, then such an event could never occur in the history of the great epic. To love and protect one's own relatives and friends is a socio-moral duty or dharma of a civilised nation and it is only a humanist or a believer in Mānava dharma who can raise his voice of protest

against the transgression of such socio-moral rules. So, the opponent's view that the Carvakas used to urge men to kill, dig, slay, burn or break to pieces all sacred things of life was not correct. In fact, the attitude of a Carvaka philosopher was to live only by choosing to live happily in this wonderful world of shade and light, misery and happiness. It was because of their firm faith in human values that they were so sharp in criticising the evil activities of the priestly class who were the master minds behind the economic, social and moral exploitation of people of the age. As the propagator of the ideal of a happy life for man, the Carvakas were the real successors of the Aryan people, who in all probability were the upholders of a positive humanistic philosophy in the sphere of mundane existence. So far as the enjoyment of worldly happiness is concerned, the Aryans were not less eager to obtain it than the Carvaka philosophers. Truly speaking, it was because the Aryans used to regard happiness as the elixir of life that in the upanisadic age the Supreme reality itself was declared to be of the form of bliss or happiness (*Bhumaiva Sukham*). We can, therefore, hold without reservation that the Carvaka philosophy was not in any way opposed to the philosophy of life of the early Aryans. This group of the Sramanas only attempted to bring into prominence the original aryan philosophy of a happy life by placing it on a firm rational and positive ground.

HEDONISTIC TONE OF THE CARVAKA PHILOSOPHY

It is known to all that the Carvaka movement was a movement of a group of free thinkers who were out to vindicate the rational and positive way of living against the traditionalism of the Vaidika priests. They actually denied the authority and the supremacy of the Brahmanas and asserted boldly the freedom of thought and will of the common people. The adherents of this movement had the outlook of a rationalistic philosopher and the secular attitude of the Carvakas inspired them to keep themselves confined strictly to wordly life and empirical existence.

Goal of Life

According to these philosophers the real goal of man was to enjoy happiness in all its varied forms, through ever-expanding flow of the stream of life at the human level. They were not in favour of searching the supraworldly values of life at the cost of the worldly ones. Life was a good thing for them and they were eager to bathe in loveliness of life, to appreciate life and to enrich life through constant intercourse with Nature and human society. In their opinion, the mosaic of a man's life should be built up only with the colourful experiences of the world. Those who believed that without a faith in the vedic rites and duties, there could be no meaning of life, were sadly mistaken. The body would perish and with the body, would perish naturally the glow of consciousness. According to the Carvakas, nobody could claim to have any experience of existence after death. Why should a man, therefore, believe in the absurd ideas of Karma and rebirth ? This school believed in the existence of those things only which could be verified directly or indirectly by sense experience. In their opinion, therefore, one should not believe in heaven, hell or God which he would never be able to perceive. A man should be interested only in the world which he could see and feel so vividly and intensely. He should not, therefore, be afraid of living and

should not hanker after Heaven and Hell. On the other hand, he should spend his money on food, drink and other forms of material enjoyment. The other worldly attitude of the sacrificial cult should be given up and no expenses should be incurred on that account.

Forms of Enjoyment

The scanty materials of the Carvaka philosophy, so far available to us as the purvapaksa of the Vaidika philosophy and religion, reveal some forms of sensuous enjoyment which appear to a modern man as undignified and gross. So, the Carvaka-ethics is generally regarded as a lower form of hedonism. This view, however, may seem incorrect if the materialistic philosophy is studied in the cultural background of the age. If we go through the cultural history of the period, when this new movement of thought started, we are sure to find that the forms of enjoyment suggested by the Carvakas were not really unrefined and gross from the cultural standpoint of the age.

In the *Barhaspatya arthasastra*, for example, it has been stated that a man should seek the company of beautiful and erotically exciting woman (*matta kāminya sevya*). Again in the *Sarvadarshana Samgŕaha*, pleasure derived from the company of women, has been described by the materialists as a coveted end.

Now, the women, whose company was thus supposed to be the source of very exciting pleasures, belonged to a particular class, called *ganika*, who were free in establishing relation with men. These women were accomplished and affluent and they used to enjoy a high status in the society. Prostitution was not a socially condemned profession in that far off age. The *ganikas*, on the other hand, were trained with special care, in the fine arts such as music, dancing, singing, acting, composition of poetry, composition of riddles etc. They also used to receive instructions in Logic, Chemistry, Gardening, garland -making etc. They were, therefore, in a position to provide both lower and higher forms of worldly enjoyment. Even the

King of the country used to honour them. So, in the age of the Carvakas, a man, who is interested in the joys of human life could not overlook this charming source of empirical happiness. *Ambapali* was one of the most honoured courtesan of her time. Even the teachers and the trainers of the prostitutes used to receive encouragement from the King. We cannot, therefore, say that by suggesting such an honourably recognized source of happiness as a desirable end, the Carvakas have degraded their philosophy of happiness in any way.

Other forms of happiness suggested by the Carvakas are :—

(1) *Āmravanam sevayet*
(should enjoy the beauty of mango-groves)

(2) Netrānjananca
(should enjoy, putting collyrium in the eye) etc.

Nobody can deny that Nature with its magnificent splendours serves as a source of never-ending delight for human minds. To enjoy the beauty of a mango-grove in the midst of its foliage, flowers and sweet scented fruits, is not despicable. Adornment of the body also gives a man immense pleasure. Even in the present age, desirability of such forms of pleasures cannot be denied. Moreover, heaven which was the most cherished goal of the Vaidika people, was only a glorified abode of material pleasures with a celestial hue. In heaven, the spirits were supposed to enjoy material things like milk, honey, wine, ghee etc. They also used to delight in the joy of love in the company of beautiful and accomplished apsarās. These pleasures of heaven are no less gross than the worldly pleasures mentioned by the Carvakas. If, even after death, a spirit can indulge in such material pleasures without lowering its dignity in any way, then how can a living human mind be supposed to lose his human-worth by enjoying the mundane blessings of life in the forms of ordinarily enjoyed material pleasures ? What the Carvakas wanted to emphasise was the positive value of the world and human-life. To them,

even the simple joys of life had a refreshing and stimulating force and as such these pleasures were not to be thrown away like dust and ashes. Happiness in any socially recognized form, was supposed to be stimulating having a refreshing effect on the body and the mind.

Attack on Vaidika-dharma

In the age of the Carvakas, the Brahmin class used to play the most dominating role in the socio-religious life of India. The priests alone used to be regarded as the deliverers of both mundane and extra-mundane good to human beings. The current belief was that men could enjoy happiness only by following the prescribed rites of the Vedas. Dharma was totally identified with the performance of Vaidika rites and sacrifices. These sacrifices were expensive and naturally the people had to spend a lot to earn religious merit. Dharma became an external commodity which was to be purchased at a high cost. It was, therefore, not unlikely that people often used to run into debt in order to fulfill their religious obligations. The Carvakas, therefore, asked the common man not to impoverish himself in wealth only to feed the greedy Brahmins who were simply exploiting him by a hoax. If one had to incur a debt, he should do so only for the nourishment of his own body and mind. (Riṇam Kritvā ghritam pivet). Why should he suffer a financial loss in the hope of gaining a better after-life when nobody had any direct knowledge of life after death ? "There is no heaven, no liberation, nor any soul in another world." The Brahmins were simply deceiving the innocent people by their perverted teachings of dharma and adharma, papa and punya. (*dharmā dharmau na vidyate na phalam puṇya pāpayoḥ*).

Hence:—

"While life is yours, live joyfully
None can escape Death's searching eye;
When once this frame of ours they burn,
How shall it ever again return." (1)

(1) Sarva-Darsana-Samgraha *Translated by* E.B. Cowell & A.E. Gough.

It is, therefore, not correct to hold that the Carvakas did not believe in the sense of cherished values of a human-life. It was the ideal of renunciation which had no fascination for them. Nor did they believe in the moral efficacy of the Vaidika sacrifices. It was only because they were very much shocked at the large-scale exploitation of the common people by the priestly class, that they came out in an open revolt against the sacrificial cult of the brahmins who were then at the height of glory and power. Carvakas were free thinkers with keen insight and broad human sympathy who could realise the worthlessness and absurdity of the Vaidika sacrifices and were eager to save man from misery and intellectual death. Dharma according to the Carvakas, was equivalent to social orderliness, consistency and human sympathy. Secrificial performance was not to be equated with dharma. Priestly class was not the custodian of virtue and merit. The king was to be looked upon as the upholder of dharma as he alone was entrusted with the duty of looking after the material and moral well being of the people. It was because the king's duty was to lead his people to the path of moral progress that he was designated as Isha. It was his duty to establish a well organised kingdom where artha, acquired by honest means (dharma) could be used for the happiness of both the biological and mental levels of human-life. The Carvakas were often found condemning hiṁsā (violence) and other impurities of mind. As gods were often described as displaying impure passions, they were called sinners by the Carvakas. (*Himsā prīyah sadā krura māmsadaḥ pāpa kārinaḥ*). If anybody bathed the Mother Earth (*kritvā rudhira kardmam*) in warm blood of animals, he could not claim to have followed the path of dharma. Was dharma to be soaked in blood ?

Again in the *Rajadharmanushasana parva* of the Mahabharata Brihaspati instructed Indra by saying that sympathetic dealing with fellow beings was to be regarded as the only act which could enable a person to win the hearts of all. Even at the time of practising charity, one should use kind and

sympathetic words. The milk of sympathy alone could add sweetness to all social relations,

Conclusion

Thus, it is evident from the above discussion that sympathy, kindness, sweet words etc. were held in high esteem by the materialistic thinkers. In fact, these moral excellences were supposed to be the ingredients of Dharma by the Carvaka philosophers. Hell was nothing but a miserable state of worldly existence. A well-ordered society, on the other hand, was to be regarded as heaven with the king as the ruling God. So, the insistence on happiness which we find in the writings of the Carvakas should not be interpreted as an insistence at the cost of the human values. Their attitude to life was out and out healthy and moral. The Carvakas had urged that people should be courageous enough to be happy in the worldly life. If anybody chooses to live happily in this colourful world, breathing its sweet scented breeze and inhaling its fragrant flowers, he is not to be described as sinful and gross. Indeed, the penance or tapasya of the Carvakas was not for the joy of an extra-mundane life but for the unspeakable delight of the mundane existence expressed through every healthy movement of the body and mind of a human being. The purpose of life was supposed to lie not in the attainment of Heaven but in the establishment of a grand harmony between the human life and the pulsating life of the empirical world.

ṚITA, KARMA AND TAQDIR

One of the important concepts we can discover in the Ṛigveda, in support of the doctrine of the unity of Reality is the concept of *Rita*. *Rita* represents the law that underlies the orderliness of the whole universe. The physical world that we see and feel all around us is the reign of a universal law. The inherent music of the world is produced by the regular vibrations of an eternal law. This eternal law has been termed the *Rita* by the vedic sages. They were able to have glimpse of the *Rita* as creating a wonderful harmony of the diversities of the world and thereby causing the creation of ever-flowing fountain of joy and love. Since there is perfect harmony in the universe, there is also peace and serenity. There is no pronounced disharmony to throw the whole universe out of its own gear. The Dawn is arising every morning according to its own inherent power; the sun has been placed in the heaven in a fixed manner. Years, months and days, too, are moving in a cyclic order according to the Rita. Thus, the Rita is the basic law that has given the cosmos its bright and orderly face. The Rigvedic hymns say :

> "Eternal law (Rita) hath varied food that strengthens ;
> Firm-seated are eternal law's foundations, in its fair form are many splendid beauties."
>
> (*Griffith*)

Again :

> "By holy law, long lasting food they bring us; by holy law have cows come to our worship."
>
> (*Griffith*)

> "Fixing eternal law, Indra too upholds it ;
> swift moves the might of law and wins the booty."
>
> (*Griffith*)

> "To law belong the vast deep earth and heaven."
>
> (*Griffith*)

Rita as the Moral Law :

Originally the word Rita was used to denote cosmic order and cosmic harmony. Gradually, from the physical, the conception as Rita was extended to the Moral World. Just as harmony is necessary in the physical world to produce a soothing and pleasing physical atmosphere, in the same manner, harmony between the higher and lower aspects of man is also necessary to keep him in existence as a human being and also to lead him to perfection. Rita is, thus, conceived as a moral law that enables a man to grow both morally and spiritually. Just as there should be orderliness in nature, in the same manner, there should be orderliness in human conduct also without which man will never be able to enjoy the undisturbed happiness of a group-life. The Rita, is thus the guiding law of both the physical and moral spheres.

The custodian of Rita :

Rita is not a god according to the Rigveda. No prayer has been offered unto it. It is the law of orderly growth and orderly behaviour of the man and the universe.

Varuna is generally regarded as the ruler of the Rita. "He made them flow, the Aditya, the sustainer : the rivers run by Varuna's commandment." The physical phenomena can never disobey the Rita and the ruler of the Rita. Obedience to the Law Eternal is the secret of peace not only in the outer cosmos but also in the inner life of man. Sometimes, Agni too is spoken of as the ruler of the Ritam. The Rigvedic hymn says. "Oh Agni ! Thou hast become Varuna, when thou strivest for the Rita."

Rita and karma :

Now, from the conception of Rita as the moral law (which is responsible for the apportionment of happiness and sufferings to human beings according to merits and demerits of their actions) has gradually grown, in a clear and definite form, the doctrine of Karma with its supreme ethical influence in the

domain of human-life. The Rita that assumes the form of the law of cause and effect in the physical world, appears again in the moral world as the law of Karma or retribution. The Brihadaranyaka Upanishad declares: "As is a person's desire, so is his will; and as is his will, so is his deed: and whatever deed he does, that he will reap." Every action in this world is followed by a corresponding reaction and it is this law of action and reaction which is called either the law of cause and effect or the law of Karma.

Karma: its Significance in Human Life:

The belief in Karma is deemed necessary to explain the inequalities of life. The visible inequalities in human life and action are not due to whims or sweet will of any supernatural power: these are the effects of the operation of a law of orderliness and retribution under the caption of the Law of Karma.

The Karma-doctrine emphasises that man is the maker of his own life. At every moment, he is creating his own future life by means of his various actions. There is nothing like a fate or destiny making human beings happy or miserable inspite of themselves. Human fate is nothing but the accumulated traces of his own interested actions done either in this life or in previous lives. The law of Karma holds that an individual has got to reap the fruits of all his motivated actions of the worldly life. It is the purity of the motive that actually determines the character of an action. Pure thoughts find spontaneous expression in pure actions which in turn lead to the creation of a peaceful and happy environment for the doer of the actions. Evil thoughts, on the other hand, pollute both the mind and the actions of the agent and create discord in his social setting. Thus, according to the law of Karma, man himself, is responsible for all that he goes through in his life and that there is no scope for assigning responsibility to any other being.

We should, however, remember that the sufferings of life, gone through by human-beings who have fallen off from the right path are not to be condemned as baneful and life-

destroying. The fires of life are necessary for spiritual growth and regeneration. In fact, sufferings and pains give a violent jerk to our entire life and then refix the root in the solid soil of goodness and moral potency. Man, thus becomes strong enough to stand erect even in the midst of injustice, unfairness and ingratitude. He gets an opportunity to dive deep into the fountain of life so as to be able to wash off all impurities which are generally found to pollute human actions. Yajnavalkya, the great sage of the Upanisadic period, remarked :—

> "His Karma alone accompanies him; it is the guardian of his destiny."

In fact, according to Indian tradition, man becomes higher or lower in psycho-biological attainments according to his own actions and Karma is the law which the supreme divinity follows in administering due retribution to every person for his action in the forms of joy and sorrow.

Taqdir :

In the Islamic religion too, the word *Taqdir* has been used by a group of Islamic scholars in the sense of a Law governing the entire creation. Each and every thing of the world that has been created by God, seems to be guided by its own *taqdir*. The Holy Book says : "God has created everything and then has ordained for it a taqdir. It is according to Taqdir or the Divine Law that the rains fall on the earth and that night and day follow each other."

Taqdir is, thus, the law of growth and development of things and living beings of the world. Everything is developing according to its own inherent law of limited potentiality. In the domain of man who is blessed with the power to distinguish between right and wrong, *taqdir* appears also as the law of his moral growth and development. While explaining the meaning of a *Qadar* or Taqdir in The Religion of the Islam, Mr. M. M. Ali has said . "*Taqdir*, of which the Holy Book speaks is of a general nature, a law prevailing in the whole of the universe, a limitation under which the whole of creation

is moving onward." *Taqdir* does not mean fate or destiny which God has finally decided for a man. He never ordains that a human being should be a doer of evil or of good. Good and evil are not created by God and then assigned to human beings in different proportions. God has created man with certain powers at a limited measure for his physico-moral growth. He has to develop within limitations of his own inherent powers. It is upto man to use these powers either for good or for evil. Hence, it is clear that human beings have created their own pleasures and sufferings. The holy Quran speaks of certain powers and faculties with which man is endowed through the grace of God ; man can use these powers within certain limitations and "the limitations of each kind are its *taqdir*."

Responsibility Lies with Man :

It, therefore, follows that good and evil are created by the actions of human beings and that man enjoys what he himself has earned by his own good or bad deeds. The Muslims, thus seem to believe in human responsibility which amounts to believing in the freedom of human-will. Man is, no doubt, rewarded for his good actions and punished for all that is bad ; but both good and evil result from man's voluntary actions springing forth from his own free will. Man is finite and as such he is endowed with powers of physico-moral growth in a limited measure and this limited measure is his *taqdir*. When he uses his limited power in the service of God and fellow-men, his measure of power or taqdir is sanctified and he is blessed with peace and happiness. That every finite being is to be endowed with a limited measure of power to act and grow in this world is the Divine law or *Taqdir* which no created being can disobey. The actual measure of power, allotted to an individual is, however, his own individual taqdir. Now, as this allocation of power is made by God, He is commonly supposed to endow every creature with taqdir of its own. Now, if a man spoils his own taqdir by his own evil desires and motives, then it is he who is to be blamed and not God.

"Whatever evil is all from yourself." Man, himself, commits sin and spoils his own taqdir with which he is blessed by Divinity.

Conclusion :

It is, therefore, not incorrect to say that the Rita of the Rigveda which is nothing but a universal law guiding and controlling the happenings of the world in an orderly and regulated way, keeping everything in its fixed place and forcing everything to grow according to its own inherent laws, resembles, in broad outlines, the Taqdir of the Islam which is also described as the divine law working throughout creation. According to both Rita & Taqdir everything in the world is subject to orderliness and consistency without which no cosmic life, in any form, is ever possible. Man should, therefore, use his powers and energies in such a manner as not to disturb the inherent harmony of the Divine Creation. He has no right which has no true source in the fundamental orderliness of the whole expansive universe. He has, no doubt, the freedom of action but at the same time, his humanity requires that he should act only to enrich the harmony of the essential orderliness of human-life and should not create any discordant note in its inherent symphony. Whenever the law of orderliness and consistency is violated, sufferings and pains envelop and darken the bright horizon of the human-world.

According to the religions of both the Hindus and the Muslims, man is the creator of his own happiness and pain. God never leads people astray. The individual himself spoils his own Karma or Taqdir by his own vicious will. It is not correct to hold that every bit of our living experience is strictly fore-ordained by God. In fact, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." The religion of Islam asserts :

"Whatever of misfortune falls on one,
Of one's own doings, it is the result."

According to Hinduism also :—

"Sukhasya duhkhasya na ko pi-dātā
Paraḥ dadāti-iti ku-buddhi esha"
("Sorrow or joy none other gives to us
False is the thought that others give us these.")

It is, therefore, clear that according to both the religions, action and its result are necessarily related. If a particular action is done, its effect is sure to follow. Just as "out of the date-stone, it is the palm only that grows" in the same way, it is unhappiness only that can grow out of an evil designed action. Both good and evil are man's own demand. All living beings and things are influencing each other in a regulated manner. So if a man causes any disturbance in any sphere of the universe by his own ill-directed actions, he is sure to eat the poisonous fruit of the tree of sin which he himself has planted in the soft soil of his own being.

THE AVATARA AND THE JIVANMUKTA

We, in India, do not make any sharp distinction between Philosophy and Religion. This is because, philosophy, for us, is not merely an intellectual affair ; it is also a way of life—a regulator of human conduct.

According to Indian view, the human life is regulated not merely by the intellect but also by the feelings and emotions. So, both knowledge and love are the guiding principles of human-life and these two are nourished and cultivated in and through philosophy and Religion. The thorough and proper cultivation of the intellect makes a man conscious of the infinite nature of knowledge and a progressive culture of nobler emotions enables him to taste the inexplicable sweetness and happiness of Infinite Love and Emotion. Hence, in India, philosophy is intimately related to Religion.

The Avatāra

The theory of the Divine descent is mainly a topic of Theology and as such this theory has its appeal more to the heart than to the intellect of a human being. In the eyes of a religious person, God is not only the indwelling principle of the whole universe of things and beings. He is also the repository of all values. As of Supreme Value, God is endowed with infinite auspicious qualities of which tenderness, affection, compassion etc. are important from the standpoint of the devotee. Due to the presence of these qualities, God is regarded as the preserver of the world. He is ever ready to help everyone who seeks his refuge. He loves his devotee so much that he does not hesitate to come down to this world to satisfy his devotee's desire for union. In fact, the word *avatāra* has been derived from the Sanskrit word *avataranam* meaning descent. An avatāra of God refers to that particular form of God which he assumes in order to come down to the expirical world which is full of strifes and struggles, miseries and frustrations.

Motive behind Divine descent :

Since God is loving and immeasurably compassionate, He can not always remain away from His devotee who is mad with love for Him. The main purpose of God's incarnation, therefore, is to come within the easy access of his devotees.

Another purpose is to punish the wicked with a view to saving vedic dharma and social stability which depend mainly on the preservation of the traditional creeds and laws of different varṇas and aśramas. Both these purposes have been mentioned in the Bhagavadgita.

Now, the forms that God assumes in all his descents are non-natural. These forms are made of pure sattva (śuddha sattva) and this body is not affected by the influences of actions. Even when He comes down to this world, His Divine nature remains unimpaired. God comes here of His own accord.

It is because God possesses His divinity even in the stage of incarnation that Krishna was able to show His cosmic form to Arjuna who was given divine eyes for that purpose. Of course, in His avatāra form, God generally remains enveloped in His own yogamāyā with a view to appearing to ordinary human beings as human and mortal.

Jīvanmukta :

A Jīvanmukta puruṣa too is not affected by selfish desires and his actions are all disinterested (meant only for the good of the suffering humanity). His knowledge, too, is infinite. He is an extraordinary person in all respects. Love and wisdom constitute the keynote of his being. He is also not lazy. It is true that he has no ends to attain and no obligation to anyone in the worldly sense. Still he has to act constantly for the good of the suffering humanity. He is the living example, the guiding star in the midst of the ocean of human tears. The disinterested actions of the Jīvanmukta puruṣa help others in the path of liberation. This being the case, one may pose a question: why should we believe in the avātaravāda when the Jivanmukta puruṣa is before us, to render all possible assistance in distress and

suffering ? Jīvanmukta puruṣa, being a super personality, is best fitted to do all that is done by the avatāra form of God to keep the world in a stable and useful condition.

Jīvanmukta less competent than Avatāra :

The Jīvanmukta is incapable of doing what can be done by the Avatara as the avatara is the same as the Supreme Divinity. The Jīvanmukta, on the other hand, is a man who has reached the stage of liberation by his own spiritual sadhana. Even when liberated, a Jīvanmukta has to remain encased in a mortal body to reap the fruits of his prārabdha karmas (although he is not disturbed by the effects of such actions), An avatāra, on the other hand, is not subject to any kind of karma bandhana (bondage, due to action). He is free in the true sense of the term as he is not bound by the law of karma. His body does not involve any enjoyment on his part as there can never be any sakāma karma in the case of the avatāra. Mere possession of a body does not make one go through the experiences of pleasures and pains. The fire can reduce a piece of paper to ashes but water cannot be so reduced by fire. Similarly though the avatara possesses a body, the body cannot become a tool for avatara's enjoyment. The avatāra body of God is non-material, is eternally free from sins and sorrows of human life.

His birth, in this world, is due to the (i) adriṣṭas or merits and demerits of his parents. (ii) Accumulated merits and demerits of all people of the country in which he is born.

A Jivanmukta puruṣa, on the other hand, is one who has worked out his own life of freedom by his own actions. Prior to his attainment of emancipation, he remains a bound soul and like a brave traveller he undertakes a difficult and long journey to an altogether new region. One must struggle hard through many lives, if one sincerely desires to attain liberation. An avatara, on the other hand, does not work out his liberation through pious and disinterested actions of many lives. He is ever free. His assumption of a body is just a sport (Līlā).

Further, even when a Jīvanmukta works disinterestedly for the good of the world, his disinterested actions, constitute, in the initial stage, only steps to emancipation which is his own highest good (svakalyāṇa). Disinterested actions, performed by the Jivanmukta (in the stage of an aspirer) with the attitude of humility devotion and selfless love for the whole universe, is nothing but his spiritual sadhana which is wholly beneficial to his own emancipation. No such sadhana, is however, necessary in the case of the avatara of God. The avatara never suffers from the illusion of narrow egoism. He is ever free. He has no sense of ownership of worldly actions. He is divine and his divinity always finds free expression in all his movements. Thus, it is clear that an avatāra, being a sportive form of God, is in a better position to do real good to this world. The super personality of an avatara arouses immense pleasure in the hearts of the pious people whereas vicious persons get afraid of his extraordinary personality. Creation and dissolution of the world can be brought about only by an avatara and not by a Jivanmukta puruṣa. Even today the pious people of India believe sincerely that God will, again, come down to earth in the form of kalkl avatara to destroy this sinful Kali age.

Avatāravāda, not dogmatic :

God, in our religion, is always described as loving, compassionate and full of mercy, These characteristics of God can be manifested only in relation to the devotees. Just as the devotee is incomplete without God, in the same manner, God also is incomplete without His devotee. The devotees are incessantly calling God to them, they are pining for Him, dying for Him, suffering terribly from the pang of separation from Him. So, for pleasing and helping his devotees, it is natural for a loving God to come down to this world in varioue forms which apparently are similar to the forms of the mortal human beings. The devotee also gets heartfelt satisfaction from the thought that if he clings to God sincerely and seriously in an attitude of purity and humiliation,

God will surely come down to unite with him. This belief works wonder in the life of the devotee and this subjective necessity cannot be overlooked by any rational mind. If we believe in the existence of a loving God full of mercy and compassion and if we believe in grace then a belief in divine descent does follow as a logical corollary.

MADHU SUDAN SARASWATI : THE GREAT ADVAITA SCHOLAR

I

Madhu Sudan Saraswati, a great advaita scholar is the author of the booklet entitled "Advaita ratna rakṣaṇam". This small book has so far drawn the attention of a very limited section of oriental scholars. In this important work, the author has made a special attempt to establish nondualism of Śaṁkara after refuting the objections raised against advaitavāda by the supporters of the bheda sat vāda. He has referred to a number of the śruti and smṛti texts showing how these are interpreted by the supporters of the bheda sat vāda. Madhu Sudan has also made an attempt to show the defects in the interpretations of the opponent group thereby proving that all śruti and smṛti texts should be interpreted from the advaita point of view.

I have written this special article with a view to placing before the scholarly world the main solution of some of the important objections of the bheda sat vāda by Madhu Sudan Saraswati. The Advaita ratna rakṣaṇam has been written in the Navya-Nyāya style and perhaps for this reason the book is not very popular with us. I have, therefore, made an attempt to present the views of this great scholar in a popular style. I am particularly referring to his views expressed in "Śrutināṁ-bhedaparatvabhangaḥ".

The following are the Śruti and śmṛti texts considered in this article :

1. Ātmā vṛ are draṣṭvyaḥ, śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsitavyaḥ.
2. Ātmanā vā are darśanena śrutyā matya vijñānenedaṁ sarvaṁ vijñataṁ bhavati.
3. Dehādestāttvikādbhedaṁ satyaṁ cātmanyajanatāṁ, mumukṣuṇāṁ namokṣoestī.....

4. Asthūlam ananuṁ etc.
5. Dve brahmaṇī veditavye paraṁ cāparameva ceti ..
6. Dvā sūparṇā sayujā sakhāya samānaṁ vṛkṣaṁ pariṣasvajate etc.
7. Puruṣa sūkta of the Ṛgveda.
8. Ajñānenāvṛtaṁ jagat tena muhyanti jantabaḥ.
9. Tadviṣṇoḥ paramaṁ padam.
10. Etasmāt Jāyate prāṇo manaḥ.....
11. Etasmat ātmano akāśaḥ sambhutaḥ.
12. Tat tvamasti.
13. Ayamatmā brahma.....
14. Ksetrajnam cāpi mām viddhi.....
15. Na tu tat dvitīyamasti.....
16. Ekamevādvitīyam.....
17. Neha nānāsti kincana.
18. Mṛtyoh sa mṛtyumāpnoti ya iha nāneva pasyati.

Interpretation from the point of view of Bheda Sat Vāda

According to the supporters of the reality of difference, all sorts of differences such as the difference between matter and the soul : the difference between the soul and the soul: the difference between one material body and the other: the difference between the soul and the highest reality—are metaphysically real. One who fails to accept this metaphysically real difference, moves round the cycle of birth and death. Non-acceptance of the metaphysical reality of difference is the root cause of the worldly existence. In the opinion of these thinkers, the meaning of the statement, dehadest-āttivikād-bhedam is that liberation can never be obtained by those who do not realise the distinction between the metaphysically real matter and the soul. Every jiva possesses knowledge of difference. There is no human being who does not feel the presence of difference. So, all the śruti and the smṛti texts should be interpreted in such a manner as to prove the reality of difference.

The śruti text "asthūlam ananum" etc. declare nothing but the reality of difference. The use of "a" in asthūlam etc.

confirms nothing but the reality of difference. Brahman has been distinguished from the material body which is gross. Brahman has been distinguished from the mind which is atomic in size. So, knowledge of difference is the true metaphysical knowledge. One who possesses this knowledge attains liberation.

Again, the śruti text "Dve brahmaṇī veditavye" also teaches the reality of difference. Here a distinction has been made beetween para brahma and aparabrahma. "Dvā sūparṇā" similarly teaches that difference is the metaphysical truth. This is because in all these texts dvitva has been used and dual number is used only where there is difference. Dvitva is bheda vyāpta and so on the basis of dvitva difference can legitimately be inferred.

The puruṣa sūkta of the Ṛgveda should also be understood to imply difference, beeause there also we find mention of a thousand heads etc. In tadviṣṇoḥ paramampadam the sixth case ending has been used and this proves nothing but the reality of difference.

The questions put by Matreyi and the answers given by Yajñavalkya also prove the reality of difference, because questions and answers can be made only if difierence is admitted as real. Where there is absolute non-difference there is nobody to ask question and nobody to give a reply.

Further the Śruti-text ātmā vā are draṣṭavyah etc teaches that the soul can be realised by four forms of knowledge acquired through hearing, through vision, through reflection and through meditation.

According to bheda sat vadīnyāya, the mind is eternal. So, the mind can never become non-existent or false. How can then a non-dualist say that all things except Brahman are false ? The śruti text that teaches "etāsmat ātmano akāśa sambhūtaḥ" should be understood in two ways. The word sambhūtaḥ means prakāśa (manifestation) in the case of eternal categories and production (utpatti) in the case of non-eternal things.

Even the mahāvākya tattvamasi śvetaketoḥ shows distinction between addressee, address and the addressor. The text "Natu tat divtīyamasti" does not declare that there is no other thing except Brahman. On the contrary, it says that there is no second Brahman. Ekamevādvitīyam, too. does not establish the falsity of everything except Brahman. What it asserts is that God is one and not more than one. When we say that the king of this mandala is advitīya or the kimsuka tree of this forest is advitīya, we mean to assert simply that there is not more than one king in that particuiar mandala and that there is not more than one kimsuka tree in that forest. We do not mean to negate the existence of elephants, horses and other trees by uttering these sentences.

Although the śruti texts like mṛtyoḥ sa mrtyumāpnoti etc or neha nā nāsti kincana declare the falsity of manyness, still these are contradicted by the perceptual knowledge of difference. Where perception establishes duality and difference, śruti cannot negate that knowledge by preaching non-duality and non-difference.

Madhu Sudan's solution from the advaita point of view

According to Madhu Sudan, there is no pramāṇa to establish that liberation can be attained only through knowledge of difference. Had there been any proof in favour of difference, then the Śruti too would have declared the reality of difference. All Śruti texts such as ātmano vā are darśanena śrutyā, matyā vijnanenedam sarvam vijnatam bhavati or tvameva viditvā atimṛtyumeti etc declare in one voice that liberation can be attained only by the realisation of nondual ātman. According to the supporters of difference, liberation is effected only when the soul is differentiated from the metaphysically real body. This is not really the true teaching of the scripture. From the point of non-dualism, it can be asserted that one who has not been able to realise the false difference of the soul from the false body and sense-organs, should be given instructions in the subject of non-dualism. There is

really no intellect which does not perceivenon-difference in one form or another, and there is no source of knowledge that does not establish non-difference. In fact the use of "a" in asthūlam ananum does not establish difference. This śruti text makes us familiar with the quality-less nature of Brahman and does not suggest that an aspirant should try to gain the knowledge of difference between Brahman and other things of the world. Nor is it logical to say that this asthūlam śruti is to be understood as giving us knowedge of both difference and Brahman, because a difference in significance can be admitted when there is a difference in the sentences used. One and the same text cannot have opposite purport such as difference and non-difference.

Further the śruti never says that it is because Brahman is different from the body that it is called asthūlam. There is no hetu hetumat ralation between the two. So declaration of difference cannot be the real significance of this Śruti text. It is also not proper to hold that admisson of tādātmya between the two radically different metaphysical reals like matter and soul is the cause of the worldly life. According to śruti and smrti, the ignorance of the true nature of Brahman is the root cause of this universe:"Ajnānenāvṛtam jagat tena muhyanti jantavaḥ. All of us possess such knowledge of difference as is manifested in the cognition of "my body". Still we are going through pains and suffering of life. We have not been liberated. Even the śruti text, namely dve brahmaṇī veditavye etc does notestablish difference. If the bheda vādī says that the use of dvitva proves difference, then the reply from the advaita point of view will be that this inferential knoweldge of difference is contradicted by the abheda śruti texts like Tattvamasi, ayamātmā brahma etc In fact, no metaphysical difference is suggested by the Śrutitext "dve Brahmani etc." Knowledge of apara brahman is necessary for acquiring the knowledge of para brahman. This ānusamgika bheda jnāna between parabrahma and apara brahma is due to avidyā.

In the same menner, the śruti text Dvā suparṇā, indicates apparent difference only and not real difference between jivātmā and paramātmā. Just as one and same tree may be both kapisamyogi and non-kapisamyogi when looked at from the point of view of avacchinna and anavacchinna, in the same way, brahman can be viewed as jivatma and paramatma when considered from different standpoints.

In the puruṣa sūkta too, there is no word that signifies difference. The apparent sense in which the Bheda vadī has tried to interpret it proves difference in respect of body only and not in respect of spirit. The expression like "thousand heads etc." does not describe the real metaphysical form of the great puruṣa. This expression simply describes the imaginary form of puruṣa suitable for upāsanā. It is only when the sattva guṇa of the mind is purified by upasanā, that the aspirant reaches the stage in which Brahman can be realised immediately.

Further, the use of the sixth case ending in tadviṣṇoḥ paramam padam does not prove difference. Sixth case ending can be used in those cases also where there is no difference As for example in the case of the head of the Rāhu. (Rāhoḥ...

The conversation that took place between Maitreyī and Yājñavalkya also centered round the imaginary difference of the empirical world. The self is to be seen, to be heard of etc, too, has been spoken of on the basis of the false world. When the non-dual metaphysical truth is realised, all questions and all queries cease immediately. Question-answer in respect of the Highest Truth is useful so long as the aspirant has not reached the highest goal. The nyāya contention that the mind is eternal and so the non-dualist cannot assert the falsity of everything except Brahman, is also not logically acceptable. The śruti clearly states the non-eternality of the mind by calling it a product. It is not proper to interpret the word "sambhūta" in two senses –manifestation and production. The adhikaraṇa namely yāvadvikāramtu vibhāga iti proves the falsity of everything except Brahman.

The difference between the addressee, address and the addressor supposed to be implied by Tattvamasi Śvetaketoḥ, is also the difference of the empirical world. This vyavahārika bheda is also recognised by the supporters of the Advaita Vedanta. The jivas are distinguished from one another by means of their different limiting adjuncts in the forms of the body, antaḥkaraṇa etc. But texts like ayamātmābrahma, ksetrajnam cāpimām viddhi etc. point out nothing but non-dualism.

It is indeed true that texts like natutatdvitiyamasti, ekamevādvitīyam etc negate the existence of everything except Brahman. In the conversation between Maitreyi and Yajnavalkya we find Maitreyi asking the following question :

"Why is it that one does not see the other in the final stage ? Is it because no consciousness exists in the highest stage ? While giving an answer to the question, Yajñavalkya has clearly stated that in the final stage there is only Brahman and nothing else. So the question of seeing the other does not arise at all. This reply of the great sage proves beyond doubt that the Śruti texts teach nothing but advaita .

The advaita śruti ekamevādvitīyam, too, proves the truth of non-dualism. The word "ekam" eliminates the possibility of sajātīya-bheda. When a man says "there is one jar" he means to suggest the absence of all other jars except that one. The word advitīyam negates vijātīya bheda (na vidyate dvitīyam yasya). Although the word advitiyam possesses the potency of establishing the reality of Brahman only, after falsifying the world of multiplicity, still with a view to preventing a less intelligent person from wrongly ascribing the distinction between dharma and dharmī to Brahman on the plea of ekatva, eva too has been used along with ekam and advitīyam. The examples selected by the supporters of difference from the practical life such as "there is secondless king in this mandal" are not suitable from the philosophical point of view. When a king is described as "secondless" the intention of the

speaker is to praise the king who has no rival. The speaker does not mean to suggest the falsity of all other things because in practical life other things are as much perceived objects as the king.

The contention of the bheda vādī that the non-dualistic significance of śruti texts like "mrtyoḥ sa mrtyumāpnoti..." or "neha nānāśti kincana" etc. is contradicted by the fact of duality perceived in this world, is also not justifiable. The question of negating one source of knowledge by another arises only when they convey contradictory cognitions regarding the same subject-matter. Here the subject of Śruti is different from that of perception. Perception gives us knowledge of that object only which is immediately present before us. It cannot give us knowledge regarding the being of an object which exists beyond the present. So perception is not competent to reveal the non contradicted being of an object in past, present and future. While the śruti delcares that the multiplicity and difference cannot claim non-contrabicted existence in past, present and future, perception reveals that multiplicity and difference are not contradicted on the empirical level. Since the śruti and perception give different declarations, the śruti cannot be contradicted by perceptual knowledge.

Difference is proved by experience. The aim of the scripture is to enlighten man on such subjects which cannot be otherwise established. So, difference which is established by our everyday experience cannot be the purport of the scripture. Hence, both introduction and conclusion of the Sruti should be understood as teaching and preaching non-difference.

Brahman, the highest reality is non-attached, without a second, of the form of pure consciousness and is also the only metaphysically real category. The world is false like a dream and is a product of illusion. There can never be a real relation between the truth and the untruth, between the changeable and the unchangeable, between the soul and the non-soul : so the śruti declares the existence of Brahman which is devoid of all

false relations and which is also the substratum of all illusory cognition.

Conclusion

Reality or non-reality of multiplicity and difference is a very important controversial issue in ancient Indian philosophy. Sense-organs of the individual are so constituted that they are always directed to external diversity, whereas the tendency of reason is to discover unity in variety. Those who cannot deny wholly the reality of perceptual knowledge obtained through external orgáns, are naturally inclined to admit the reality of difference. The knowledge of difference as a fact of our empirical life is not, however, denied by anybody. Whether this difference is metaphysically admissible or not is the real issue of philosophical discussion. The vāsana or saṁskāra that originates from our dailiy experiences naturally becomes very firmly rooted in us. So we do not readily agree to disbelieve the reports of our various sense--organs. Since difference is a fact of perceptual experience, it receives our approval easily; but if we seriously reflect on the power and potency of perception to prove the reality of difference, we become apprehensive, because we find that the external object cannot fully be known through perception. In the perception of the whole (*avayavi*) for example, our sense-organ does not get related to all the parts : hence the sautrantikas maintain that the external objects cannot be known through perception. They are to be established only through inference. Indeed, we find that it is difficult for us to assess the value of perception as a source of knowledge and unless that can be done, the reality of difference cannot be established.

When the jar is perceived, is it a fact that we also perceive its difference from the cloth ? If the difference is perceived, do we perceive the difference of the jar from all other objects or from one particular object only ? The opponent of the advaitavāda—may reply that when he perceives the jar, he perceives

its difference from all the objects known to him. If this be so, then again, a further question will arise : "Will the objects unknown to the opponent be perceived as non-different from the jar ?" If so, then the opponent will have to admit non-difference at least in regard to unknown things. If the opponent refutes this by saying that in respect of unknown objects, there is not even the perception of non-difference, then from the advaita point of view, he may be requested to hold that in respect of known objects, too, there does not occur perception of difference.

MADHU SUDAN SARASWATI : THE GREAT ADVAITA SCHOLAR II

In the previous article, I made an attempt to present the views of Madhu Sudan Saraswati with particular reference to his views expressed in "*śrutīnām bhedaparatva bhangaḥ* (*Adavita ratna rakṣaṇam*).

In this article I shall make an attempt to present his views with reference to his *sūtra* No. 4 i. e. *atha sarva buddhibheda viṣaya bhangaḥ*

It is generally held against the Advaita Vedanta that the non-dual scriptual texts which are admitted by the Advaita-school as evidence for the declaration of the Highest Being as differenceless, cannot be accepted in that manner ; because the sources of knowledge such as perception etc. which prove difference will then be opposed to these *śruti*-texts.

Madhu Sudan Saraswati in his sūtra "*atha sarva buddhibheda viṣayabhangaḥ*" points out that this view of the realistic school is unsound. This is because perception can never reveal difference.

Incapacity of the Perceptual Knowledge to Reveal Difference :

Perception is generally divided into two forms—indeterminate (*nirvikalpaka*) and determinate (*savikalpaka*). The Advaita Vedanta holds that *nirvikalpa pratyakṣa* is incapable of revealing difference since it manifests only the differenceless pure being. Even *savikalpaka* perception which grasps a qualified object does not, in the Advaita opinion, reveal difference of one qualified object from another. When the jar is perceived, the determinative intellect or the *savikalpaka* buddhi only assumes the form of "this is jar", "this is cloth" etc. In other words in the determinate knowledge of the jar, the things present before the perceiver are, at the very first moment, the

jar, jarness and the relation between the jar and the jarness etc. It is the *vaiśiṣṭya* in the form of the relation between the jar and the jarness which is grasped only in the full-fledged determinate knowledge of the subsequent moment and there is no other thing present that can be admitted as difference.

It cannot be said that the difference is an ingredient of *vaiśiṣṭya* because we find that *bheda* and *vaiśiṣṭya* are always mentioned separately by different words. The realists may object by saying that *vaiśiṣṭya* should not be supposed as an extra-thing, different from difference, as in that case, the law of parsimony will be violated. *Vaśiiṣṭya* is to be regarded as a form of difference because it is the *vaiśiṣṭya* of the jar that differentiates the jar from all other things which are not jars. This is what is known also as *atdvyāvṛtti*. So the difference which is of the form of *ananyābhāva* is the same as *vaiśiṣṭya*. Hence, the knowledge of *vaiśiṣṭya* is the knowledge of differrence. Udyāanācarya has said : *atdvyāvṛtti vaiśiṣṭyamiti*. Here Madhu Sudan Saraswati raises a question : how does knowledge of *vaiśiṣṭya* in the form of *atadvyāvṛtti* arise in the case of the cognition of the jar, arising just after the passing away of the *nirvikalpaka* stage ? He further assumes that the realistic school will perhaps try to answer his question by saying that just as prior to the knowledge of the qualified object in the *savikalpaka* stage, one has to have hypothetical knowledge of *viśeṣaṇa*, and also the recollection of the *saṁjñā*, in the same manner prior to the cognition of *vaiśiṣṭya* in the *svaikalpaka* stage, recollection of *vaiśiṣṭya* has to be supposed. The possible answer of the realists, however, is not acceptable to Madhu Sudan Saraswati because *vaiśiṣṭya*, in the Advaita view, must be something over and above the noun, adjective and their relation. Even in the *savikalpaka* stage (as we have seen), the knowledge of the first moment, is different from the knowledge of the second moment. In the first moment, we have the knowledge of stick, man and the relation, whereas in the second moment, we have the knowledge of a man with a stick (Daṇḍī puruṣa). There is difference between cognitions of

these two moments. There is something more in the second cognition (because *daṇḍa* is cognized as being related to puruṣa as an attribute) than in the first. This "something more" is termed as *vaiśiṣṭya*. If we do not hold that there is something more in the second moment than there is in the first, then the knowledge of the first moment too will be the knowledge of a qualified object.

Since it is impossible to explain *savikalpaka* cognitions of the two moments without considering *vaiśiṣṭya* as something additional besides noun, adjective and relation and also as merging only in the second moment, the question of violating the law of parsimony does not arise at all.

In the opinion of Madhu Sudan Saraswati, *vaiśiṣṭya* cannot be regarded as a form of *atadvyāvṛtti* even from the point of view of the realistic *Nyāya* school. This is because unless there is the knowledge of non-blue, there cannot be knowledge of the difference from non-blue (i. e. *anīla-vyāvṛtti* or *anīlabheda*) in the case of the cognition of a blue lotus. If it is urged by the realists that here the memory of non-blue will serve the purpose, then too, the situation will not improve ; because memory of non-blue is not possible unless there is prior knowledge of the blue. How does the knowledge of blue arise in the first stage ? Moreover, everything besides blue is included in non-blue and so it is not possible for any human being to have a full knowledge of the non-blue in one life.

We may ask what actually is meant by *anīla-vyāvṛtti ?* Does it mean difference from blue ? Or does it mean some positive thing that can be designated as *anīla* ? If it is the former, then there will be the fallacy of mutual dependence. Blue is to be known as something different from non-blue and non-blue is to be known as something different from blue. Then how are we to know these two mutually dependent objects ? It we accept the latter alternative (i.e. non-blue referring to something positive) then the knowledge of that positive thing is occurring without the knowledge of difference (*vyāvrtti jnāna*), If this is so, then we can

very well say that the knowledge of blue too, arises without the knowledge of *vyavṛtti*. Truly speaking, when we cognize the cow, our cognition takes the form of "cow" only and there is no knowledge of the negation of non-cow. *Gotva-vaiśiṣṭya* which is revealed in the awareness of the cow is positive and not negative. It is, therefore, not proper to explain cowness in terms of *agouvyāvṛtti*. Again, if cowness is the same as *agau-vyāvṛtti*, then cowness as a universal will not be established and this will be prejudicial to the philosophical position of the realistic school.

The author of *Tattvacintamani* has said that it is only after one is aware of *daṇḍi puruṣa*,that he comes to cognize *adaṇḍa-vyāvṛtti* (negation of non-stick) in the *daṇḍi puruṣa*. Had the first moment of *savikalpaka* knowledge been the revealer of *vyavrtti*, the word *anantara* would not have been used.

Comments

If we analyse critically the perceptual position of the *Nyāya* and the Advaita school in the light of what has been stated by Madhu Sudan Saraswati in this particular *sūtra*, we find that the two positions differ from each other in the following manner :

According to Advaita Vedānta, the first moment of the determinate knowledge reveals noun, adjective, relation etc. in unrelated units. It is only in the second moment that the knowledge of the thing (noun) as qualified by the attribute (*vāiśiṣṭyāvagāhi*) arises. So the knowledge of *vāiśiṣṭya* arises in the second moment of the determinate knowledge. According to the Nyāya school, the noun, adjective, relation etc are cognized as unrelated units in the indeterminate knowledge which resembles to a great extent the first moment of the determinate knowledge of the Advaita vedānta. The stage in which the substantive-adjective relation is established is known as the savikalpaka or the determinate stage by the Nyāya-school Now this cognition of substantive-adjective

relation is what is necessary for the knowledge of difference. Just as knowledge of two is at least necessary for having combination or relation between things (because *sva* cannot be relative to *sva*), in the same manner cognition of at least two things is necessary for having the knowledge of difference (Sva cannot be differentiated from sva). After the arousal of this cognition, the knowledge of difference arises easily, provided there is no pratibandhaka to prevent it. Now the positions of these two schools when analysed from the point of view of knowledge and also from the point of view of object (sāmagri), stand as follows :

Advaita point of view

1. Jnana-viśleṣaṇa : First moment of determinate knowledge; knowledge of noun, adjective, relation etc. in unrelated conditions (viskalita jnāna).	1. Sāmagri viśleṣaṇa : First moment of determinate knowledge : Noun, adjective, relation etc as unrelated units.
2. Vaisistya-jnāna : In this stage, there is an increase in knowledge.	2. Emergence of vaisistya as relation between noun and adjective. In other words there is emergence of something new as a result of ghata-ghatatva sambandha. So, there is an increase on the objective side (sāmagri-kṣetra).

The Nyāya point of view

Jnana-viśleṣaṇa :	Samagri-visleṣana :
1. Nirvikalpaka stage of knowledge where there is awareness of noun, adjective, relation etc. as unrelated units.	1. Nirvikalpaka and savikalpaka do not differ in their sāmagri or object.
2. Savikalpaka stage of knowledge : knowledge of substantive adjective relation. (Increase in knowledge).	2. Savikalpaka unfolds all that is implicitly involved in the nirvikalpaka stage. So there is no increase in the object. The knowledge may be regarded as containing the seed of the knowledge of difference.

From the above analysis, it is clear that according to both the schools the cognition of *vaiśiṣṭya* arises only after the awareness of the noun, adjective, relation etc. as unrelated units. Differences of opinion arise only in respect of the form of *vaiśiṣṭya*. The Advaita holds that when there is *vaiśiṣṭya-jñāna*, something new and positive is added to the content or object of cognition. So *vaāiśiṣṭya* is not the same as *atadvyāvṛtti*. According to Nyāya however, the object or content remains the same from the first moment to all the subsequent moments. In fact, when the undifferentiated whole is analysed and substantive-adjective relation is cognized spade work for the knowledge of difference is done by the perceiver. *Vaiśiṣṭya*, in the opinion of the Nyāya school, is the same as *atadvyāvṭtti*. So from the Nyāya point of view, there is no increase on the objective side of knowledge. Changes occur only in the knowledge-aspect.

The author of the *"Tattva Cintāmani"* has no doubt said that cognition of *adaṇḍa-bheda* arises after the cognition of *daṇḍī puruṣa;* but this statement truly implies that it is from the point of view of knowledge only that *atadvyā-vṭtti* arises after *sambandha;* from the point of view of the object, however, there is no change. Again, the seed of *bheda grahana* is sown as soon as the perceiver cognizes *dandi puruṣa*. So there is no harm if one admits or does not admit *ānantarya* between *sambandha* and *atadvyavrtti*. According to Advaita, the noun, the adjective, the relation etc. nay, the whole of the object of knowledge is *vikalpa* (thought construction). When there is increase in knowledge, there is also an increase in the *visaya* of knowledge. According to Nyāya, however, the object of knowledge is real. There is *sannikarṣa* between the sense organ and a real object. Since the object is real, it remains the same from the first moment of *sannikarṣa* till the end. Knowledge of the object may be vague or clear, *viśada* or *aviśada* but there can be no change in the real object of knowledge.

SURESVARACHARYA : THE GREAT ADVAITA PHILOSOPHER

That birth is not really a painful fall from the height of Divinity is best illustrated by the glorious life of Suresvaracharya who was born in the ninth century A. D. By coming to this world, he was indeed able to serve the humanity as a source of never-ending Light for ages to come. He was a worthy heir to advaita tradition because he had to his credit a number of advaita texts of which *Naiskarmyasiddhi* was the most valuable.

Suresavara & Mandana Misra

The commonly-held view about Suresvara is that he and Mandana were not two different persons. It was Mandana who was named Suresvara when he became a disciple of Samkara. Mandana was a great *Mimamsa* scholar; when he was defeated by Samkara, he decided to become the pupil of Samkaracharya. Prof. Hiriyanna, however, is not in favour of identifying Suresvara with Mandana. According to him, Mandana was the author of Brahmasiddhi, but nowhere in the available texts relating to Suresvara, he was ever spoken of as the author of the said text. In his philosophical outlook also Suresvara differed fundamentally from Mandana and so in the opinion of Prof. Hiriyanna, he should not be identified with Mandana Misra.

Some Aspects of his Philosophy

In the advaita vedanta, we come across three important views regarding the relation between Brahman and the individual soul : 1. Pratibimbavada : 2. Abhasavada: 3. Avacchedavada.

Suresvara was an upholder of *abhasavada*. According to this view, *jiva* is a semblance (abhasa) of Brahman. Just as the *abhasa* of the face is different from the face and is false, in the same way, the semblance self (cidabhasa) is different from Brahman and is false. The *jiva* is a mere appearance of Brahman in the *antahkarana*. Since there are many *antahkaranas*, there are many *cidabhasas* (semblance selves) and so there are many *jivas*. This semblance self is different from Pure Conscious-

ness and is false. *Jiva* undergoes pleasures and pains according to his own actions and so *Jiva* can never be regarded as non-different from Pure Immutable consciousness. Just as pleasures, pains and their enjoyment are false, in the same manner the semblance-enjoyers too are false. So, there can be no liberation unless the *cidabhasa* is negated. Just as the form of a man (purusa-svarupa) is realised only when the pillar-knowledge or *sthanu buddhi* is completely destroyed by *purusa-buddhi*, in the same manner the nature of Brahman is realised when *jiva-buddhi* is completely negated by Brahma-awareness. The *samana-dhikarana* (apposition) between the *jiva* and *Brahman* is through sublation and not through identification.

The *abhasa* of *cit* in the *jada* (unconscious) principle cannot, however, be confirmed by logical arguments; but this is to be suggested as otherwise the apparently intelligent actions of the unconscious principle cannot be explained. The *antahkarana* though unconscious, is yet acting in the manner of a conscious principle. So, to explain this apparently conscious activities of the internal organ, we have got to suppose the *abhasa* of *cit* through it. This view of the advaita has a close resemblance to samkhya because the latter also believes in the *cetanavista* (permeated with consciousness) condition of the buddhi. Purusa, however, does not undergo any change due to such *avesa*. The intelligised *buddhi* acts in the manner of a conscious principle. Of course, according to Suresvara, internal organs, external sense organs etc are false, but according to samkhya, buddhi, ahamkara etc. which catch the reflection of consciousness are all real.

In his philosophy, Suresvara has contended that emancipation cannot be obtained through performance of actions. It is the true knowledge revealed through *Vedanta Vakya* which alone possesses the power of destroying ignorance completely : but action which is not opposed to ignorance cannot destroy it. Action thrives on ignorance and then blossoms into innumerable petals (in the forms of dharma adharma etc) which result in bondage and pain. Liberation is not anything which is

produced; it is the same thing as destruction of ignorance and ignorance is destroyed only by knowledge. Daily and occasional duties only help the agent to purify his intellect and it is with this end in view that the aspirant is advised to perform his daily and occasional duties. (Naiskarmya siddhi 1. 50). Performance of daily duties results in the generation of merit; merit removes vices, and thereby the intellect is purified. Purified intellect then reveals the real painful nature of the world to the aspirant which in its turn produces detachment to worldly objects. Then the aspirant becomes extremely eager for liberation and follows the path of knowledge. Thus, action is only an indirect means (upaya by parampara). In fact, there is an antagonism between knowledge and action. Knowledge negates action. Just as a lamb cannot live in the company of a lion, in the same manner, knowledge and action cannot remain together in the same locus. So, knowledge must not be combined with the performance of duties i. e. no jnana karma samuccaya. Since true knowledge and liberation are one and the same thing, it does not require the performance of the *nityanaimittika* actions.

The view which Suresvara has tried to refute so vehemently in *Naiskarmyasiddhi* is *jnana karma samuccayavada* of which Bhattriprapanca was an adherent. According to Bhattri the ultimate reality is both one and many. Dvaita is real, and so action which is based on *dvaita* feeling is also real. So, the *pramanya* of *karmakanda* must be admitted. There is, therefore, joint necessity for knowledge and action. But the samkhya philosophy which is dualistic is not in favour of the theory of *jnana karma samuccayavada*. According to *Pravacana bhasya* there can never be a synthesis of action and knowledge just as dream objects and objects of waking experience can never be combined to serve any purpose of life. Suresvara, however, has refuted this theory mainly on two grounds :

A. The conception of Reality as being both one and many is self-contradictory.
B. When oneness is realised and the otherness is removed by knowledge, there can be no duties to be performed.

We should remember that action which has been referred to in the *Naiskarmyasiddhi* by Suresvara does not include *niskama karma*. If we go through the texts carefully, we shall find that by action, he has really meant only the actions prescribed in the *Mimamsa* and which are all based on the feeling of duality. The different adherents of *jnana-karma samuccayavada* have interpreted actions in the sense of *Vaidika* duties which pre-suppose a feeling of difference between the agent and action. *Niskama karma* which becomes possible only when the ego-sense is removed, does not pre-suppose duality. Hence, it is proper to say that even in the opinion of Suresvara, self-less action can be synthesised with knowledge and that there is no antagonism between the two. When Suresvara describes the relation between knowledge and action as one of opposition, he really considers actions which are done with a sense of duality and which also bring about pleasures and happiness of this world or of heaven : but when the feeling of *sva* is absolutely destroyed, action is wholly spiritualised. To link one's life with the life of divinity is not only to lose one's existence as an individual but also to regain one's reality as egoless pure consciousness. In fact, when an individual has made himself totally free from the sense of agency, he does nothing even he keeps himself engaged in disinterested social service. The freed soul works for the guidance of men who are still steeped in ignorance. He is the doer of work and is yet not the doer because he has no sense of "I" and "mine". Disinterested service is the outer side of spirituality and knowledge is the inner side. The performance of actions in a disinterested manner is linked up with social consciousness which in turn produces the feeling of universal brotherhood. Hence, selfless service cannot be decried. Suresvara's main concern was to attack the *karmakanda* so as to refute the theory of *jnanakarma samuccay* and this he had done in his *Naiskarmya siddhi* with great success. Indeed the performance of action based on the experience of duality and difference can never be synthesised with the advaita-realisation.

SPIRITUALITY AND HUMAN LIFE

(This article is the summary of a speech which Dr. Anima Sen Gupta gave at the death anniversary of Mme Blavatsky held at the Theosophical Society, Patna. She says : "The theosophi-ists do not preach any doctrine which is foreign or unintelligible to us. The doctrine of universal love, altruism, disinterested actions, re-incarnations, karma etc. are the flowers and fruits of the tree of Indian philosophy and religion. When we go through the teachings of Mme Blavatsky, we find she loses her foreign heritage and stand before us as a perfected personality of Indian soil and Indian culture. —Editor)

In the present age of science and technology, the word "spirituality" is often misunderstood and misinterpreted, The word spiritual, the common Sanskrit equivalent of which is *'adhyatmika'* refers really to that which is internal to the person. The 'atman' the life essence, the mind etc. are all internal and so everything pertaining to any one of them may, in a wide sense, be regarded as 'adhyatmika' or spiritual: the concept of spiritual is central to the cultural heritage of India.

In Indian philosophy; however, the word spiritual is not used to mean the mental or the physical: on the contrary, it refers to supramental consciousness which is the innermost core of a human being. The true spirit is the whole or the full reality which is called 'purusa' or 'atman' or 'Brahman' in the Upanisads. This trans-psychical, pure, immutable and self-revealing soul or spirit is not a mere dogma propagated through the Indian scriptures. This has been firmly established on the strength of evidence gathered from the intuitive realisation of the 'yogins' and men of wisdom and also on the basis of 'yukti' or rational argumentation.

The consciousness that constitutes the innermost self of man is thus the only thing spiritual, because it is the spark of

reflection or mode of that Great Spirit which forms the transcendental background of all appearances.

Spiritual movement, then, according to Indian tradition, is the movement of Life and Nature towards that Great 'Atman' which is the soul of all. Indian philosophy, therefore, believes in the evolution of the human soul from ignorance to knowledge, from an inert condition of existence to a fully illuminated state and this spiritual evolution needs re-incarnation times without number.

The true human life is the life of the spirit. The shell of flesh and blood is only an artificial covering of man : it is because of this artificial shell, born of ignorance, that the individual soul appears as a worldly being in a pitiable condition and goes through a process of birth and death. This is the natural life of a man from which the soul is to be dissociated. The spiritual life, which is the life immortal, does not, however, supersede the natural life immediately as if by magic. This regeneration needs spiritual culture which finally culminates in knowledge of truth and real being of man. The unveiling of the immortal man, the birth of the spiritual from the psycho-physical is the true purpose of human life and this purpose is to be fulfilled through continuous moral efforts in all spheres of life and existence. Such are the teachings of the upanisads.

Teachings of Mme Blavatsky

Like an upanisadic sage, Mme Blavatsky, too, has believed in the evolution of human life from ignorance to knowledge. She has, therefore, laid stress on the uprooting of ignorance which hides self from our vision. The discovery of the self, she asserted, is the real purpose of human evolution. In the teachings of Blavatsky, we find the echo of the upanisadic call 'atmanam viddhi' or 'know thyself'.

The belief in the oneness of the ultimate reality brings the teachings of the theosophists close to the teachings of the 'vedas' and the 'upanisads'. A verse of the Rig veda declares :

"There is only one Reality but the wise men call it by many names."

A text of the 'Atharva Veda' proclaims:

"He is the One, the One alone,
In Him all Deities become One alone."

The Sveta upanisad declares:

"Rudra is the only Lord. They do not maintain another God. He rules the worlds by means of his powers, or "There is only one God : He resides in all: He is all-pervading and He is the innermost soul of all."

The theosophist too proclaims:

"The whole phenomenon of manifestation is only a play of the Absolute. Using His chit shakti in cosmic Ideation, He manifests through the universe." Now, the absolute of Theosophy is also of the nature of Consciousness. Self or consciousness, therefore, is the root reality. This is spiritualism.

There is a wrong impression about spiritualism even among the intellectuals of our country. It is held that a spiritualistic philosophy is nothing but a life negating philosophy; and as such, it is capable of producing only a race of half-naked Fakirs or half-starved ascetics. It is, therefore, a thing to be despised by all means.

If we go deeply into the spirit of Indian culture, we shall find that this impression is not correct. A true spiritualistic philosophy never neglects the positive background of human life. As a matter of fact, ancient Indian thinkers have tried to impress upon the people the usefulness of the educational system, social ethics and good political organisation, through which human beings can reach the highest goal; i. e. the discovery of the self or the realization of the self. The life divine is being continuously displayed through the positive, the secular and the material. So, the positive, the secular and the material can never be sacrificed for the quest of the life beyond. What Indian sages have been trying to say is to bring about a synthesis between the worldly and the other worldly, between metaphysics and social science.

Moral Values

The human life appears in a particular environment and it has to become related to other embodied souls for the satisfaction of its various psycho-physical needs. The social life of individuals is built on the basis of these relations. In a spiritualistic social system, these relations are grounded on such moral principles as Truth, Equality, Non-violence, Love, Forgiveness, Self-control and Self-sacrifice. This is because spiritual enlightenment can never be obtained without moral discipline.

The moral values should constitute the foundation-stone of the social life because these are the values which are closely inter-linked with the spiritual value which is Peace or self-realisation. It is only the pure mind that can discover the self and the purity of the mind can be attained by the acquistion of moral virtues. Cultivation of moral virtues is possible only in a well organised society where relations between man and man are coherent and harmonious. How can we, then, ignore or despise the social life of man ?

The Ramayan, for example, gives us a nice picture of a well-regulated social life based on moral and spiritual principles. Here, Valmiki, the great sage, has beautifully idealised the different kinds of social relations which exist between man and man and as members of a social unit. In this epic, we see the picture of the ideal king, the ideal son, the ideal brother, the ideal wife and the ideal servant. This is an evidence to prove that according to Indian spiritualism, every day life of a man in the society should never be ignored. On the other hand, the human life, in a society should be so regulated that in and through the ordinary vibrations of the empirical life, a preparation for testing the bliss of the Life divine is continuously carried on.

Mahabharata

In the Mahabarata also, we find that same humanitarian outlook on human life emanating from a firm faith is spiritualism. Here also, we find that the social ideal is to awaken in man all human excellences which will make him fit for the realisation of his true being as ātman.

The attainment of self-realisation according to our scriptures, is quite compatible with the virtuous life led in this world. There is no need at all for giving up of all connections with social life and social activities. The Mahabharata has laid great stress on Truthfulness, self-sacrifice, honesty, straightforwardness, knowledge, contentment, love, mercy etc.

Enjoyment as material happiness should always be coupled with a spirit of self-sacrifice. The spiritualistic thinkers of India do not preach the philosophy of world negation. On the other hand, they teach us the right way of living the worldly life ; the glory of human life consists solely in the renunciation of the selfish motive. If enjoyment is sought for the sake of selfish satisfaction only, then this form of enjoyment will produce nothing but greed, hatred and 'himsa' which always act as forces of disruption in an organised human life.

We do find such a humanitarian outlook in the teachings of the theosophists as well. They too think that it is the duty of a man to work for the welfare of others in a disinterested manner. Mme Blavatsky has proclaimed: "Giving to others, more than to oneself" is self-sacrifice and such self-sacrifice should constitute the guiding principle of life of a theosophist. Egocentrics desires are not to be cultivated and one should always be prepared to work for the welfare of the world. Since there is only one Reality and the individuals are merely centres of consciousness in that Reality, there is no real difference between individual and individual. All life is one. It is the one Reality which is manifesting itself through thousands of forms. Like the Vedanta philosophy, the theosophy also preaches the doctrine of universal love, self-sacrifice, just dealings with all fellowmen etc. "Live for other" is the motto of a theosophist just as it is the motto of true followers of the ancient Indian tradition.

Spiritualistic System

From what we have discussed it is clear that spiritualism is in no way antagonistic to the healthy development of human life. On the other hand, in its unfalsified form, spiritualism is

the strongest support of morality and is the most efficient moulder of life and society. Spiritualism never preaches anti-materialism; but it does not assert that material happiness and comforts, which are no doubt necessary, are not the highest values of life. The highest value lies in the discovery of the self which is the essential being of man. Life begins in a material world and the material world does charm a man, nourish him and provide him with all the material necessities of life.

The self, itself, remains wrapped up in a material covering—a covering to which we have got to give such importance as is its legitimate due. But man has got to discover his inner essence which is of the nature of the spirit. The discovery or the realisation of this spirit constitutes the highest goal of human life. It is a case of transcendence and not of antagonism between spiritualism and materialism.

As one ascends higher in the scale of spirituality, his material happiness gets transformed into the happiness of the spirit. At the ordinary stage, the happiness of the soul remains mixed up with the happiness of the world and in that stage, the happiness of the world gets prominence. This is the natural law of wordly life. A spiritualistic system does not give an independent significance to the material principle. Materiality always derives its significance from spirituality with which it remains in association. It is the spiritual which is of the highest value; so even in the case of material enjoyment and worldly action, an adherence to spirituality must be prominent. This is spiritual culture.

Spiritualism never teaches that man must be poor and hungry in order to be spiritual. Attention to the needs or desires of the physical body never disqualifies a person for spirituality. A spiritualistic philosophy only teaches that man should not regard material happiness as the ultimate goal of life and should not, therefore, get too much attached to material pleasures emotionally because in that case he will be psychologically incapable of giving his best attention to the spirit which is his real essence. One who can realise that self

alone is of supreme value will become naturally indifferent to material things which has got only an instrumental value for him. Spiritual culture in india is based mainly on the virtue of 'aparigraha' which means a dispassionate attitude towards material prosperity through the perception of its being tainted by cruelty, injustice and other defects. Referring to 'aparigraha' Swami Vivekananda has said: "In the west, they are trying to solve the problem of how much a man can possess and we are trying to solve the problem on how little a man can live."

Lastly, I would like to stress the points that the theosophists do not preach any doctrine which is foreign or unintellegible to us. The doctrine of universal love, altruism, disinterested actions, reincarnations, Karma etc. are the flowers and fruits of the tree of Indian philosophy and religion. There may be difference here and there in the interpretations of these theories from the point of view of a theosophist; even then when we go through the teachings of Mme Blavatsky, we find she loses her foreign heritage and stands before us as a perfected personality of Indian soil and Indian culture.

THEOSOPHY & ANCIENT INDIAN WISDOM

The theosophists have explained that the basic principle of theosophy is the ideal of brotherhood of Man. Reality is one and the individuals are merely so many centres of consciousness in that One Reality. We are all one life. There is only one God who resides in all. It is the One Reality which is manifesting itself through innumerable forms. There is, therefore, no real difference between Man and Man. The differences which we notice in worldly life, are artificial and false.

Like the advaita philosophy, the theosophy also preaches the doctrine of oneness of all as the ultimate truth of life. The rich and the poor, the educated and the ignorant, the high and the low, are all rooted in the same manner in the Life Eternal. All are, therefore, bound together by the sacred thread of fraternity; all men have a common end to realise, a common purpose to achieve by mutual help and mutual sympathy. The common end is the spiritual regeneration or the revelation of the essence of man. Man has got to evolve from ignorance to knowledge, from an inert condition of existence to a fully illuminated state. Such a spiritual evolution pre-supposes a life of spiritualised action which is nothing but the dynamic aspect of the feeling of universal love coupled with an attitude of helpfulness to other persons. The feeling of brotherhood of man finds its spontaneous expression in the desire to be of some help to others who are also the parts and parcels of one Infinite existence. When a man purifies his thought and life by selfless love and devotion to God and humanity as a whole, his action at once takes the form of a spiritual sadhana and tends to promote human progress and perfection.

Madam Blavatsky

The dedicated life of Madam Blavatsky was indeed a life of such "spiritualised action" so magnificently advocated by the sages of ancient India. It is really the deep love for life eternal that alone can melt the heart of man with the warmth of sympathy, kindess and compassion for all living beings. Disinterested service which is a cardinal principle of theosophy is, thus, the active aspect of the ideal of Brotherhood which forms the nucleus of the theosophical teaching.

Service as an Ideal

A theosophical believer is expected to worship God in his daily life with a true service for the welfare of mankind. Self-sacrifice is the theosophist's sacred oblation that he offers unto God; Madam Blavatsky has proclaimed: "Giving to others more than to oneself" should constitute the guiding principle of life of a Theosophist.

Ego-centric desires are not to be cultivated and one should always be ready to work for the welfare of the whole world. When a man sacrifices his own happiness for the welfare of his fellowmen, he actually pours out his own life into the Great Stream of life which is flowing from beginningless time without any break. It is at this moment that he realises the essential unity of life and also becomes conscious of the inherent harmony that exists between giving and receiving. According to theosophy, life-stream does not flow throughout its whole course with equal vigours and freshness ; there are some centres which are weak in energy and are, thus, in need of re-filling. It is only when all the centres are equally rich with happiness and strength that the entire life-stream can flow smoothly with immeasurable joy and inexplicable brightness. Sacrifice, therefore, is necessary as it pours out the elixir of life from the strong centres into those which are weak. Thus, the act of sacrifice is an act of delight and expansion and not of pain and loss. A theosophist pleads : " a clean mind, free from selfishness

and greed, a brotherly feeling for all, a strong sense of justice and a readiness to give" should constitute the keynote of a theosophist's life. If any member does not give expression to this ideal in his daily life, he ceases to be a theosophist.

The theosophical belief in the universal brotherhood and oneness of the Divine Life, mingled with a sincere desire to serve humanity in a selfless manner, does not appear to be either new or foreign to the believers in ancient Indian faith and religion. In fact, these are the teachings of the vedas, the upanishads, the Gita and the epics etc. The bodhisattva ideal of Buddhism too embodies a sincere belief in the disinterested service for the welfare of all sentient beings Madam Blavatsky has rightly remarked that Hinduism and Buddhism contain profound truths and as such they deserve better treatment.

The harmony between the active worldly life and the higher life of the spirit effected through the performance of selfless social service constitutes an important trait of Indian civilization and culture. Socio-ethical values are believed to be closely interlinked with the spiritual value which is liberation. In fact liberation is nothing but the finest flowering of these socio-ethical excellences. Egoism or selfishness has always been decried by the sages of ancient India. In the Yajurveda, for example, we meet with a very positive altruistic view on human life emanating from a firm faith in spiritualism. The Sages declare: "O ye men, increase the store of goods acquired by honest and fair means to be used in the service of humanity. May your life be completely dedicated to the principle of selfless service. May the spiritually minded people also not give up this humanitariam work,"

(*English trans* : *Devichand*)

Again we hear:

"I resort to agriculture and craft for removing poverty and ministering happiness to all."

(*English trans* : *Devichand*)

The Mahabharata also lays stress on the cultivation of an altruistic frame of mind for the attainment of social prosperity as well as spiritual perfection. A well-governed and prosperous city is one in which all people are happy, virtuous free from greed and selfishness, truthful and are also mutually helpful to each other. The foremost duty of the king is to give food to those who are hungry. The king of a country should always be ready to sacrifice his personal happiness for the good of the people. He should also be responsible for developing an altruistic spirit in his people. The cardinal principle of virtue such as truthfulness, non-injury, compassion, friendliness based on the feeling of fraternity and disinterestedness in action are to be practised by all without exception because these are the principles for the well-being of the society and also for self-purification culminating in liberation.

The concept of a Bodhisattva too, is the concept of a spirit soaked in the milk of sympathy and compassion for suffering humanity. He does not seek his own highest good; on the contrary, he is ever ready to suffer for the purpose of removing sorrows of all living beings. In fact, he becomes a Buddha for the good of his suffering fellowmen. The Bodhisattva declares:—

"When fear and sorrow are as much undesirable to me as they are to others, then why should I work for my own perfection only and not also for the perfection of others ?"

The Upanisadas, too have taught us to respect the worldly life, to honour the relations existing between man and man; to love all; to respect all to perform our duties and to live for a full hundred years by doing good deeds so that the society may prosper and produce more and more good for the benefit of all.

In the Manu Smriti, particular stress has been laid on the performance of humanitarian service, as according to it, the primary duty of the householder is to support the students, the sannyasis and the vanaprasthis who are not in a position to earn their livelihood. The householder should always be

ready to help others with cash and kind in case of emergency. When an individual performs social duties in a selfless spirit of service, it is possible for him to destroy his narrow egoism which is supposed to be the most powerful knot of our bound-life. Indeed, a sense of duty carries with it a sincere desire to serve others. Man canot realise his oneness with all, unless his narrow ego-sense is completely swept away by the ever-rising waves of altruism.

Glory of Renunciation

To repeat : the sages of ancient India have proclaimed again and again the glory of renunciation of the selfish motive without which no spiritual progress is possible. In the family life as well as in the life of the society, enjoyment should always be sought with selflessness, sacrifice and detachment. It is the beauty and bliss of God which is to be enjoyed by us in and through all relations which exist between man and man.

In the Bhagavadgita, Arjuna was asked by the Lord Himself to work disinterestedly for social good and social welfare. It is the duty of the elightened soul to work for the good of mankind. The attitude of service and the feeling of affinity with all constitute the most effective means by which a man can fight and conquer a purely natural life and fulfil his mission of spiritual perfection. "Live for others and not merely for your own self," is really the motto of a karmayogi, because he sees all in himself and himself in all. A Karmayogi has realised the fundamental nature of the self as different from the body; he looks upon his own self as of the same nature as other selves. A Karmayogi is described in the Gita as "sarvabhutatmabhutatma."

For lack of space, I have made a brief survey of the ancient Indian ideal of human life and action on the empirical plane of existence; this will make it clear that from the dawn of civilisation, Indian people have felt and expressed a sincere

desire to imbibe excellent qualities of man—qualities which spring forth spontaneously from a firm faith in spiritual oneness and Brotherhood of all living beings. Life is to be lived by each one of us for a harmonious development of all; otherwise evolution of the human world will shrink considerably and there will be no scope for human progress. Whenever we act from greed and selfishness, whenever there is a conflict and maladjustment in our day-to-day life, the rythmic progress of spiritual evolution is disturbed by undesirable jerks and consequently there is retardation in human progress and perfection.

The cardinal virtues of love, sympathy, friendliness and compassion should therefore, be practised by all with the force of conviction, so that these alone may constitute the key-note of peace and progress. In India, the search for truth primarily means a search for the moral and spiritual values of life. Moral development is an inner growth stimulated by firm faith in Divine heritage of Man. This superb faith in Divine origin flows out from the heart of an individual with such a force that it remoulds him in a newer and nobler form. The unveiling of the immortal man—the birth of the spiritual from the psycho-physical—is the true purpose of a man's life and this purpose is to be fulfilled through universal love, knowledge and disinterested service. Such are the noble teachings of ancient India.

We do hear similar echo in the teachings and writings of the Theosophists. For example, a theosophist says : "He who does not practise altruism, he who is not prepared to share his last morsel with one weaker or poorer than himself, he who neglects to help his brother-man, is no theosophist" Like a true Hindu or a true Buddhist, the theosophist, too, believes that it is *Trishna* or the selfish desire that actually binds a man to a life of disharmony and discord; "a loving selfless and helpful nature" alone can win the grace of the Great Masters of the human race. Like the sages of ancient India, the theosophists, too, believe that the limited and

non-eternal joy of life can never give man permanent peace and eternal happiness. Just as the Upanisadic sage has declared: *"Jo vai bhuma tat sukham*
Nalpe sukhamasti."

"That which is infinite is really bliss. The limited can never give us real and permanent joy." In the same manner Mrs. Besant has said: "The first cry of the soul for liberation is the result of realisation that the earth has become to him a prison and let it be decorated as it may be he pants for the free and limitless air beyond its inclosing walls." Worldly pleasures are "limited transient unsatisfying. He is tired of the changing; from very weariness, he cries out for liberty."

Indeed, the theosophists have churned the ocean of ancient Indian wisdom and have been able to discover the precious pearls embedded therein. The ancient Indian beliefs that Brahman manifests itself in flesh and that the triumph of spirit over flesh is the final truth of life, are equally shared by the theosophists. According to theosophy also, ātmavidyā or spiritual knowledge is the real truth and the primary duty of a man is to know his own self. As a matter of fact, both ancient Indian Philosophy and theosophy speak of one essential unity that makes one see the supreme soul in all things and all things in it; the feeling of separateness is thus destroyed and the feeling of fraternity is revived. Like the upanishads, the theosophist also says: "As rays from a sun, all spirits flame forth from the Great Mind; here is the source of their being, here the central fire whereof all are sparks."

Civilisation

Truly speaking civilisation can flourish only when a world, based on humanitarian sentiment of goodwill, brotherliness, active sympathy, finding expression in disinterested service and a strong sense of duty comes into being. Let both Theosophy and ancient Indian wisdom give us hope and inspiration to create such a world. Let us look only at the soul of man—

the real spiritual being which is of the same illuminating nature in all living beings. We must remember that the soul belongs to no nation, no society and no country. It belongs only to the Divinity. Let Immortal Spirit of Madan Blavatsky touch and purify our whole being so that we may be able to carry the message of oneness of life to all parts of the world and make the earth an abode of peace, harmony and happiness:

"Nectar blow all the winds
Nectar pour all the rivers
Nectar be the dust of the earth
Nectar be our guardian heaven."
Om Peace, Peace, Peace.

YAJNAVALKYA —THE GREAT SAGE OF MITHILA

Just as an artist, even though highly gifted, can never paint movement without giving it an unmoving form, in the same manner, a person with a limited intellect is not in a position to catch the spriit of the thought currents of a Great Mind from a distant age. The writer is conscious of her limitations and she knows full well that she has undertaken the difficult task of expressing in a brief outline, some of the soul inspiring ideas of Yajnavalkya, the great sage of Mithila. A brief-sketch, based on scanty materials, available, from the extant sources, will, however, be helpful to understand the highly enlightened mind of the sage.

Yajnavalkya—a man of versatile genius

Yajnavalkya, the great sage of the Brihadaraṇyaka upaniṣad was an inhabitant of Mithila. He probably belonged to the 7th century B. C. and during that period, Magadh was not organised like Mithila. At that time, the philosophical field wes dominated exclusively by Yajnavalkya. He was the spiritual teacher of Janaka, the king of Mithila. From what has been stated in the Brihadaraṇyaka Upaniṣad and the Mahabhārata, we can very well affirm that Mithila was an important centre of the spiritual culture of India in that far off age. Janaka and Yajnavalkya were the two shining stars of Mithila and two luminous personalities were bright enough to illumine the whole of India.

Yajnavalkya was a man of versatile genius. His interests were manifold and knowledge was also deep and profound. He made notable contribution to religion, morality, metaphysics and social philosophy. He composed Satapatha Brahmana. The whole of Yajurveda is proclaimed to be promulgated by him. His knowledge of Samkhya-Yoga was thorough and wide. He was the master of the knowledge of Brahman and was also a noted scholar of the purāṇas. He so declared

in the Mahabharata while giving spiritual instructions to a King. (Tathaiva Romaharsena purāṇamava dhāritam). Being the knower of Brahman, he had no fascination for the ritualistic religion of the Karma Kāṇda of the Veda. He declared emphatically that fulness and eternal bliss of life could be attained by the knowledge of Brahman or Atman alone. If one would make fire offerings and perform sacrifice without making efforts to acquire the knowledge of the highest and the best (i. e. Ātman or Brahman) then he could enjoy only the transitory fruits of his actions both here and hereafter. Eternal peace would elude his grasp. Like an inaccessible star on the distant horizon, it would attract him but would always remain beyond his reach.

Again, Yajnavalkya's answers to Sākalya's queries (as narrated in the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanisad) reveals that in the opinion of the great sage, the followers of Karma Kanda could reach only the region of the Death. It was the custom of the age that the sacrificer had to buy back sacrifice from the priests by paying them remuneration and hence the relation betwen the sacrificer and the priest was not a sacred spiritual relation. It was only a worldly relation of give and take. Yajnavalkya, on the other hand, believed that one could not taste the bliss of the Life Divine unless he was able to rise above all self-centred relations of give and take. The anti-ritualistic attitude which developed so remarkably in the teachings of Mahavira and Buddha, was, perhaps, the legacy of the liberal and profound philosophical teaching of this great sage of Mithila. Yajnavalkya also advocated the eating of the flesh of cows and oxen and his approach to life was not conservative. In the Mahabharata, we find him declaring :

"Sarve varṇā Brāhmaṇa
Brahmajaśca,
Sarve nityam Vyaharante ca
Brahma."

All varṇas have originated from Brahman and all persons should, therefore, be treated as Brahman. All are uttering the name of Brahman and so no varṇa should be regarded as separate from Brahman. By so declaring, Yajnavalkya not only exhibited a liberal attitude to social life but had also pointed out to us the real spirit that was to be discovered at the root of the varṇa arrangement of ancient India. The soft, tender and brilliant mind of the great sage did appreciate the value of man as man and had emphatically declared that the varṇa-vibhāga should not be understood in any sense other then the sense of the allocation of duties to different classes according to their capacities. All men should be regarded as equal so far as their human nature was concerned but their intellectual capacities and practical abilities did differ. It was, therefore, to utilise the abilities of all to a maximum degree for the welfare of the society that the class-division was introduced. The division of society into four classes of people was made to further the progress of both the individual and the society. Every person was to equip himself according to the social duties allocated to him and he was also expected to devote his heart and soul to the proper discharge of his duties. Under this system, the individuals of various capacities could get equal opportunities to show their inherent powers in different spheres of life. This was indeed a harmony of multi-coloured personalities, the keynote of which was Brahman, the Life Eternal.

According to Brihadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, Yajnavalkya had two wives, Maitreyi and Katyayani. Maitreyi was keen on acquiring the knowledge of the highest and the best as that alone could enable her to reach the completion of life. When Yajna Valkya was going to embrace Sannyassa, leaving his householder's life, he wanted to distribute wealth and property between his two wives. At that time, a fine discussion on Self-love and Self-knowledge was held between the husband and the wife and even today, this discussion is regarded as a crest jewel of Indian Spiritual Culture.

The keynote of this discussion is that wealth and property can enrich a man only outwardly; these cannot purify the inner personality of man. So long as a man remains interested only in the material gains, he moves in the material world of give and take, receiving and rejection and cannot come out of this prison-house to bathe in the soft and ever-refreshing Light of the Ātman. He cannot get at the complete personality which is a level of pure awareness, a level of joy.

The enlightened personality of Maitreyi was not at all satisfied merely with living in ignorance and thinking only of the material gain and loss of this world. She had a desire for truth, for good, for beauty and also for the spiritual fulfilment of life. She was eager to reach the level of value-awareness after rejecting all needs and demands of the narrow life of the empirical existence. She knew that her husband was a highly enlightened personality who had reached the highest level of life. He had gained a perspective of new values which were far nobler than the biological and social values of life. So, the wife, being drawn by her intense desire for good, wanted to know from her wise husband the true path by following which she would be able to blossom and hold herself upwards like a sun-flower with a view to bathing her own personality with the nectar of immortality. Yajnavalkya, then, discussed with her the nature of that immortal spiritual essence in man by tasting which an individual could become immortal and could get immersed in the Great Delight. The precious words which were uttered by Maitreyi when she had been informed about her husband's intention to divide property between his two wives, were the finest expressions of a dispassionate spiritual mind which was keen to know the mystery and values of the various aspects of human existence. Maitreyi asked, "Lord, if this whole earth with all its treasure be mine, shall I be able to attain immortality through them?" Yajna Valkya replied in the negative "Earthly riches", said he, "were to be looked upon as means to earthly happiness only. The deeds which one could do with wealth could never lead one to Immortality." On hearing this,

Maitreyi replied, "What should I do with wealth and property then, if these cannot raise me above the mortal life of the earth?" Thus, she refused to accept the material gift from her husband as these would not enable her to get submerged in the unique thrill of Delight and Immortality. The wife was, thus, truly equal to her husband in purity and detachment. She could feel the presence of the Great Uniting thread of the world in the inner glow of her heart. The path that Yajna Valkya then explained to his wife was also the sweetest and the finest one that a human being could ever follow to reach the apex of his life. Yajna Valkya declared "A husband is dear to the wife not for the sake of the husband, a wife is dear not for the sake of wife, a son is dear not for the sake of the son, wealth is dear not for the love of wealth;-all these are dear for the love of the self."

The significance of these words is that we do not love anything or being of the world for its own sake but we love them for the sake of the Ātman which is the Delight itself. In other words, the Ātman is the real fountain of joy and love and whatever joy or delight of finite life, we experience in our various loving relations with beings and things of the world, is the pouring out of that Infinite Delight through the earthly mediums. Wife, husband and sons are truly the occasions when Delight that exists in the inmost core of a man's heart in the form of his self, begins to grow in purity and expansiveness, depending on all relations of the finite human existence. So, we should not allow ourselves to be swallowed completely by the outside world. We should always try to discover the self in the inner vision of our heart. Hence Yagna Valkya instructed Maitreyi by saying "The self, my dear Maitreyi, should verily be realised; should be heard of, reflected on and meditated upon." Without pinning one's faith completely in the Delight of the Great Ātman, one will never be able to attain immortality. The entire creation is the manifestation of the Great Atman and being so, the world has become the abode of immeasurable delight that flows into the heart of man through manifold relations of the organic and the inorganic worlds. The centri-

fugal principle of the entire creation is atman, the bliss and therefore, the atman should be the true object to be known and adored by man. One should not think that living beings and non-living things of the world are different from the Atman. They are neither independent nor complete by themselves. If a man fails to have a vision of the uniting thread that runs through life and the universe, he will not be able to assess the value of the world properly and will run madly after things of the world with an intense longing for their possession. In that case, he will lead the life of a self-centred and small person driven far away from the truth and pure joy of life and will be cooked undeliciously in his impure juice, losing for ever the vision of immortality. To make this point clear, the great sage declared emphatically : "This Brahman, this Ksatriya, these worlds, these gods, these vedas, these beings and these all are only the self." It is the self that is immortal and to realise the self as the inner essence of one's being after withdrawing the mind from the transitory objects of the world, is to realise immortality. Just as one can grasp the particular notes of a drum only by grasping the general note due to which the particular notes are melodious, in the same way, one cannot enjoy the particular pleasures of life in the forms of wife, sons, riches etc. without discovering their perennial source which is the Delight of Atman. These immortal words which once issued forth from the mouth of the great sage of Mithila are still serving as the living and the most inspiring message of India to the outside world.

The underlying meaning of Yajna Valkya's teachings is that all sweet and soft emotions which a man feels through his different relations with the things of the world emanate from the blissful nature of the Atman; plants and trees, flowers and foliage, rivers and hills are all permeated by the Delight of the Atman and the sweet and refreshing joy which these natural phenomena scatter, are the finite expressions of that JOY Eternal. If a person can feel intensely this underlying prin-

ciple of unity and can receive this wonderful message of the oneness of Life and Light running through the different levels of existence, then he can easily rise above the narrow selfishness of individual existence and can melt himself into the sweetness of a disinterested universal love which possesses the potency of embracing the whole of the creation It is by knowing the entire creation as being permeated constantly by the Delight of the Atman that one can realise his relation with others on a universal level and can expand his own existence to embrace the existence of all. He then becomes free from all passions of the heart and becomes a symbol of Immortal Love and Light.

CONCLUSION

While paying our respectful homage to the illustrious son of Mithila, we can say, without exaggeration that it is Yajna Valkya who has raised human love to a higher level by linking it with the Delight of the Atman. It is through the emotion of love that one can feel the expansion of self by identifying all loveable objects of the world with his own self and, thereby, becoming aware of a bigger existence that also opens up a wider perspective of his own being. He has eulogised the love between husband and wife by declaring that when husband and wife lose themselves in love, then each of them is aware of nothing else but a single existence, saturated through and through with joy and happiness.It is only the deep experience of love that can unfold a new dimension of truth in the form of oneness of life. Yajna Valkya declared, thus, while explaining the identity between the supreme soul and the individual soul, "As a man fully embraced by his dear wife, knows nothing external or internal, even so this individual self, fully embraced by the supreme self, knows nothing external or internal." Sincere and pure love is a uniting force and this force, if used softly, tenderly and in a pure manner, is sure to lead to the

blossoming of ourselves as manifestations of the Great Atman; because the soul, being both cit and ananda, can grow in knowledge as well as in emotion of Love. Love starts with a feeling of duality between the lover and the beloved but when it grows deep and intense, the lover finds his beloved in the innermost core of the heart as completely related to him and feels oneness with her. One enters, as it were, inside the other and there is nothing but a single awareness, a single experience, a single feeling of Joy and Delight. The efficacy of love to raise man to a higher level of existence when felt as an expression of bliss of the self (as advocated by Yajna Valkya) has added sanctity to family life which is an important limb of the social life. The Satapatha Brahmana which has been composed by him, has praised householder's life by declaring that society can maintain its own stability only when house-holders succeed in building up happy and healthy homes. In his opinion, the family life and the social life of man should be linked with the Life Eternal. That he valued the material things as well which, in his opinion, could make a man's life in the society happy and prosperous is clear from the question which King Janaka had put to him when he entered into the King's Court on a particular occasion (as narrated in the Brihadaranyaka Upanisad). The passage runs as under:—

"Janaka, Emperor of Videha, took his seat to give audience when Yajna Valkya arrived. The emperor said to him "With what object have you come ? Desiring cattle or some subtle questions for discussion." "Both indeed, O Emperor." said he, (ubhayameva). So long as one has not embraced the life of renunciation. he desires every thing which is necessary for a healthy and fruitful social life. The sage himself proceeded on his life journey. Step by step and even at the time of departing for the forest life, he thought of his two wives and tried to make provisions for their fruitful earthly existence. Even in one's efforts for Brahma-realisation, he seemed to be in favour

of moderation. In his opinion, austerity should not be practised with such rigidity as would lead to death.

The most brilliant colour that the sage of Mithila has added to the varied tradition of Indian culture is undoubtedly the linking of the best of our empirical life with the life eternal. The life on earth becomes noble only when it is saturated through and through with the sweetness and freshness of deep and disinterested love. Yajna Valkya has taught us how the different forms of love of our empirical life such as conjugal love, the love of children, wealth, cattle etc. can be ennobled and sacrificed by experiencing them as expressions of the love of the Self. It is only in this way that we can advance from our empirical life to the life of Light and Knowledge without feeling any contempt for the worldly objects. Our journey to the apex of life is a journey from the finite expressions of Light to the Light itself. The unity with all creatures, when realised through knowledge and love, gives us a very delightful and all pervasive concept of existence. The various forms of joy that start from a man's ownself in relation to persons and things of the world, are to be regarded as having its ever-expanding source in the Delight of the Atman. At such a wonderful moment of a wide and expansive existence a man finds that these refreshing forms of experience are leading him to the apex of life wherefrom by looking down he can find nothing that is dark, nothing that is ignoble, nothing that is sorrowful or fragile. Everything partakes of the nature of Light and Love. He has plunged himself, as it were, into the very source of Light in which he has lost his separate existence. That love is ever cheerful and has the power of making every item of the world cheerful, when directed with a proper perspective of the love of Self, is the immortal song that Mithila has contributed to the multiple musical notes of ancient India. Self is immortal and self is Delight, Truth and Beauty. Truth comes through the path of Beauty and Delight and Beauty and Delight aain find expression through Truth. India can never forget Maitreyi,

the wonderful female scholar of Mithila whose intense eagerness for the attainment of immortality will always cast a refreshing influence on the cultural life of our country; nor can India put out of her mind the image of Yajna Valkya who has declared beautifully that pure and disinterested love, rooted in the love of the Atman, can lead to the blossoming of a man's life even though the object of his love is a worldly one.

———

DATE DUE

FEB 3 1995
APR 6 1995
MAY 4 1995
SEP 15 1995
OCT 24 2002
NOV 13 2001

GAYLORD PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
B131 .S44 1977 G
Sen Gupta, Anima/Essays on samkhya and o
3 2400 00151 7998

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-250
All items are subject to recall

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Anima Sen Gupta is now Head of the Dept. of Philosophy, Patna College. She has been contributing regularly articles on different aspects of Indian philosophy in Indian as well as foreign journals. She has tackled the formidable task of writing several valuable books on Sāṁkhya philosophy, namely "The Evolution of Sāṁkhya School of Thought" : "Chandogya Upanishad : Sāṁkhya Point of View" : "Katho Upanishad : Sāṁkhya Point of View" : "Classical Sāṁkhya : a Critical Study" : and "Sāṁkhya and Advaita Vedanta : a Comparative Study." These books, produced for the first time, were hailed by scholars as a brilliant study of the Samkhya system.

Her comprehensive work "A Critical Study of the Philosophy of Ramanuja" has been well appreciated by the scholarly world in India and abroad.

All the essays in the present work are brilliantly written, each maintaining an original line of approach, and also shedding a new light on some of the riddles of philosophy.

Those interested in Indian philosophy will find the "enlarged edition" most satisfying and rewarding. The Universities and Degree colleges in India will do well to take advantage of this valuable publication so that post-graduate students in Indian philosophy may acquire a better knowledge and understanding of the riddles of Indian philosophy.

15th August, 1977

M. R. S.
Publisher